

yn
er-
ia,
all
ole
in-
ere
ful
one
ca-
ight
ev.
er,
oz;
ty;
her
ex-
pa;
her
sor
ent
end
ight
hop
ted
tal

rly
ore

The Catholic University Bulletin.

VOL. X.

JULY, 1903.

No. 3.

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit*, c. 6.

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA,
LANCASTER, PA., AND WASHINGTON, D. C.

Ca

Vol.

PRESS OF
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY,
LANCASTER, PA.

The Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. IX.

July, 1903.

No. 3.

ON THE ITALIAN RENAISSANCE.

By the word "Renaissance" is usually meant that period of mediæval history in which the ideas, tastes, artistic principles, and the political spirit of Græco-Roman or pagan antiquity for the first time asserted themselves in Christian society, and finally, to a greater or lesser extent, prevailed and affected the development of all Christian peoples. The time, roughly speaking, is the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries—though the glorious and typical period really comes to an end with the death of Pope Leo the Tenth, and the careers of Raphael and Michael Angelo. In something less than one hundred years there occurred, chiefly in Italy, a vigorous advance in all that pertained to classical learning and the fine arts. First the Latin and then the Greek authors of antiquity were either discovered for the first time, or studied and appreciated from a new point of view. The best manuscript copies of them were sought out with avidity. Popes and kings, bishops and rich individuals, kept great scholars travelling in all directions for such literary treasures. An unknown work of Cicero, or a fragment of Tacitus, was hailed with scarcely less enthusiasm than the discovery of America. The conflict of the great popes of Rome and the emperors of Germany, the political failure of the Crusades, the increase of the city populations, and the growth of new cities, the perfection of social intercourse, the rise of great banking houses, the in-

creased value of arable lands, the growing trade of Venice and Genoa and Florence with the Orient—the only immediate result of the Crusades—were so many remote causes of this revival, which is less a sudden outgrowth than a natural development of the Middle Ages.

Then, the popes had come back to Rome at the opening of this period. The unhappy schisms that were rending Europe before the rival claims of three or four bishops to the See of Rome had been finally settled at the Council of Constance (1418) to the content of Christendom, and that pontifical unity restored which has now lasted for five hundred years. Rome was again a center of government, and the papacy again a Roman institution. It was no longer in the hands of one nation, France, nor dominated by the interests of that one people. Italy itself had gradually emerged from the political anarchy of the fourteenth century into a certain unity. Five great states were solidly established on the Italian peninsula and held a balance of power that was not disturbed with success until the end of the fifteenth century, when the municipal revolutions of Florence opened to France, Spain, and Austria the road of successive domination over the peoples of Italy. To these five states—Naples, Venice, Florence, Milan, and Rome—were subject a multitude of smaller cities and principalities, in greater or lesser degree, with more or less acquiescence. Some of these states were quite feudal and aristocratic, others quite popular and democratic. Still, the land was administered with a certain regularity of system. The prosperity of Italy was perhaps never greater; there were wars and sieges and revolutions—but they were seldom bloody. The Italians themselves are now traders and farmers. The wars are carried on by wandering bands of hired ruffians from Germany and England and France—the famous Condottieri, whose aim is always to save their own carcasses and extort the last penny from their employers. Nearly everywhere the old popular liberties have lost their meaning, the popular constitutions have ceased to operate, and the political power is held by some bold and resourceful man. Liberty had mostly been be-

gotten in turbulence and disorder—when the period of partition was over the masses sank exhausted to the level of mere enjoyment. In the Italian city-states henceforth it is the age of the "tyrants," the "despots," very much like certain periods of old Greek history, when the richest merchant in the state seized on the reins of authority, slew or exiled or imprisoned the heads of factions, imposed his will on the people, gave them peace and comfort, and put the revenues in his own treasury. Italy was dominated by these men—the Medici in Florence, the Farnesi at Naples, the Visconti and Sforza at Milan, the Baglioni at Perugia, the Malatesta at Rimini, and a host of smaller but no less masterful men, no less quick watchful and resolute. They were nearly all new men, either scions of the smaller nobility, or daring spirits from the lower strata of Italian life. None of them inherited his power. Each one got it by some deed of violent political boldness or "*virtù*" that command universal attention and admiration. Of course, he held his standing, his "*stato*" by the same policy. To such men the classical revival, particularly the Latin, became an instrument of government. The native Latin scholars got employment and salaries and distinction from them. It came about that an Italian man could advance more quickly with a Latin speech of Ciceronian elegance, or a mouthful of sharp and pungent epigrams, than with a big warhorse and a coat of mail. Moreover, all this was in the history and manners of the people of Italy, whose soil had been for centuries the "dancing-field of Mars," the "dark and bloody ground" of Europe. The centers of government were no longer the lonely castles or cloud-kissing burgs of the Apennines or the Abruzzi. The hard and unlovely feudal rule of Colonna and Orsini, of Frangipani and Conti, was over with the Gregories and the Innocents, the Henrys and the Fredericks. Italy was now governed as of old, from her cultured cities. She still knew only a government by *imperium*, but it was now to be exercised with the moderation born of *humanitas*. The stern mediaeval fortress was abandoned with its moat and its drawbridge, and the house of the despot, the very spot where he

had risen to greatness, was enlarged, beautified, and made the seat of government. Enough big Germans and Englishmen, adventurers and semi-outlaws of all Europe, were kept on hand to overawe the unruly elements of the population, to form a bodyguard for the despot, but the palace was given over practically to the enjoyment of life—to the recitation of poems and tales of chivalry, to musical and theatrical entertainments, to every kind of amusement that could beguile the uncertain leisure of the master and his numerous household, or distract the wealthy and the influential from meditation on the gilded slavery into which they had fallen. The despot's position was by no means secure from revenge, envy, or popular whim. Now and then velleities, vague souvenirs of liberty, awoke faintly in the heart of some exalted youth, or romantically transfigured reminiscences of popular freedom stirred up some belated Rienzi. But the Italian peoples were now prosperous in peace, and all such fruitless efforts stand out as proofs of the general contentment with the political situation. The republican spirit was dead, and the peninsula was moving through despotism and oligarchy to its final monarchical constitution.

The last century was the great epoch of inventions. They crowd one another so fast; we are so near them, so in the midst of the far-reaching social changes they are imposing on us, that we can not yet appreciate with finality their importance. So it was in the fifteenth century with practical politics. Events of the greatest interest for the world followed with startling rapidity on one another—the healing of the great Schism of the West (1418), the Fall of Constantinople (1453), the growth of Venice as queen of the seas, the natural ambition of regenerated France to pose as political mistress of Europe, the simultaneous creation of a splendid Spanish monarchy that dominated Germany, Austria, Italy, and the Netherlands, and undertook to dispute those claims of France on a hundred bloody fields. On all sides human interest, curiosity, energy, were aroused. Infinite opportunities arose, even before the discovery of America. Man came almost at once to know himself as the source of the greatest things, to look on him-

self as capable of infinite progress in any direction. After the long mediæval era of collectivism an era of individualism had set in, and the Italian man was the best equipped for the new order of things. His experience, bought in blood and tears, in a multitudinous wrestling of several centuries, was his title to preëminency. A long series of historical events was behind him, during which all the great factors of European life had arisen, developed and conflicted with one another. It was an hour, if ever, for the philosopher of history, and he was at hand. It was in this Italian political world, at once old and new—old with the religious heart and experience, the faith and the family life of the Middle Ages; new with all the prophetic stirrings and impulses of the future—that Latin and Greek learning, the poets, philosophers and historians of pagan antiquity, found the nation of disciples best fitted for them. The Italian tongue is the Latin tongue of the common people, peasantry, and soldiers of old Rome, only modified by contact with the Teutonic dialects and filled with a new Christian content and spirit through contact with Catholicism. So the Latin classics, as they came back into daily life with Petrarch and Boccaccio and their nameless contemporaries, with Valla and Poggio and so many others, awoke from their secular sleep, as it were in their own family circle. Their spirit and their ideals of life and man, their vague or negative teaching about the soul and the future, their amorphous notions of God, righteousness, sin and evil, their cold cynicism and ruinous agnosticism, their ineffable obscenity and their cringing adulation of force and success, their hopeless moral debasement and their refined intellectualism—all these things came back with them and appealed to the rising generation of Italians with a siren voice. Literature was always their national weakness, and the sources and agencies of it—schools, books, writing—were always better preserved in Italy than elsewhere. The monuments of Roman grandeur were there; her cities never forgot that they were the homes of the great poets; Mantua boasted of Vergil's birth, and Naples of possessing his tomb; Padua was proud of her historian Livy, and Tibur of her satirist Horace. It was the first thing that

the children in the schools learned and the last thing that the aged citizens forgot. All through the fifteenth century went on a constant excavation of the soil on the sites of these ancient cities, with the result that thousands of marble statues were found, the best work of a multitude of those Greek sculptors of the early empire who repeated for their imperial masters, at Rhodes or elsewhere on the coast of Asia Minor, the masterpieces of the glorious art of their Hellenic fatherland. The Law of Rome, that perfect mirror of the genius of the Eternal City, had for four hundred years been the constant study of Italians, both laymen and clerics, and thereby they had risen to eminence, not only at home, but in every land of Europe. Its spirit of absolutism, its enticing suggestions and examples of administrative centralization, its large and luminous principles, its appeals to human reason and the common experience of mankind, its temper of finality and practical infallibility, made it the great working code of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries—likewise the sepulchre of mediæval liberties and independence.

This universal Italian interest, as commentators and exponents of an old national system of law and order, naturally developed much intellectual liberty. A lawyer is notoriously useless if he cannot see at least one other side to every question that can arise. And there were many of them in contemporary Italy who had been long accustomed like Hudibras, to

“Distinguish and divide
A hair 'twixt south and southwest side.”

Then, too, the layman had never been so ignorant in Italy as in Germany and England. Not only was the career of the law always open to him, but also that of schoolmaster, of notary, of tutor—and the noble and rich youth of Italy was always brought up by tutors. Vettorino da Feltre and Guarino da Verona were only excellent in a multitude of lay teachers of the quattrocento. The man of Italy was architect, artist, jurist, traveller, merchant—in a word, just as the bishops of Italy dominate less in the political life of the nation than those of Germany or England, so there was in every city and

town a clear-headed and self-conscious percentage of laymen, highly educated for the time, and persuaded that they were the representatives of the majesty of ancient Rome. Their hearts and minds were of course like wax for the new movement toward a revival of the times in which their forefathers had governed all civilized humanity.

These elements alone would have sufficed to create a Renaissance of learning on the soil of Italy. And, indeed, it was far advanced when Greek scholarship came to its aid, and gave it a powerful impulse and a logical basis. As a matter of fact the poetry philosophy and art of Rome were originally borrowed from the Greeks. The Roman, left to himself, was a shrewd farmer, a patient obedient soldier, a painstaking lawyer. Farther afield in the world of the mind, the Catos and Scipios never went—in fact, they scented a grave danger in the absolute intellectualism of Greece as soon as it rose above their social horizon. But the fine mind of Greece was too beautiful—and beauty has always an hour of victory—to be kept out of the Roman City. And so from Ennius to Vergil, it was the schoolmistress of the heavy rustic Latin, a tongue of fields and cows, of beans and peas and fodder, of rough policemen and dickering peddlers. The Roman knew that his soul had no wings, but he bore the veiled sarcasm of his Athenian or Corinthian teacher for love of the graceful forms into which he was soon able to cast his thoughts, the very ones that he had borrowed from the gifted children of Hellas. He had destroyed their archaic autonomy, he had laid waste their small but marvellous state—this was their revenge, that in the hour of gross material triumph the spirit of Rome prostrated itself before the spirit of Greece and divided with the latter the hegemony of mankind.

And so, in the latter half of the fifteenth century, when that splendid seat of Greek life and thought, Constantinople, was unhappily lost to Christendom, there was an exodus, a flight of its learned proletariat, the gifted and needy but often unprincipled and immoral scholars of the Christian Orient. From the Golden Horn and the Greek cities of Asia Minor they came in great numbers to Italy. Every city of the peninsula

welcomed them, every little court invited them. Only, Florence, the City of the Golden Lilies, was especially generous. Here a great family of merchant-princes and bankers, the Medici, had long been absorbing, by a complicated system of accounts, the political authority, long been debasing the democratic spirit of the once rude and proud commonwealth by the Arno. Cosimo de'Medici, and his grandson Lorenzo the Magnificent, were among the extraordinary men of history—self-willed, working now by cunning, now by violence, gifted with a clear untroubled vision of their aims and the practical means to attain them, rich beyond past example, judiciously prodigal, cautious and certain in their deliberate enslavement of the Florentine. In and through the Medici, themselves enriched democrats, the democracies of northern Italy finally fell a prey to the new monarchies that it took a Napoleon to overthrow. But if they were enemies of the popular liberties, the Medici were the patrons of letters and arts. Their money flowed like water for manuscripts of the Greek and Latin classics, for museums and galleries where all the curiosities of antiquity were gathered, for collections of coins and medals, for every bit of skilled handiwork—engravings, bronzes, marbles, ivories, miniatures, intaglios, jewels—for all that was rich, rare, and beautiful. Under their protection the learning and poetry of Greece were made known again to Italy after an estrangement of twelve centuries. Aristotle was taught, but not the barbarous Aristotle of the schools—he was now read in the original texts. Above all, Plato was set up as the true master of the mind, the one man who held the secrets of existence both here and hereafter. His magisterium was unquestioned, his mellifluous sentences were held the very breathing of divinity. His highly spiritual philosophy drove out from the schools the exact and severe logic of the Stagirite. At the same time its vague and uncertain idealism ate in like a cancer upon the stern moral conceptions of life, duty, sin, judgment, that were essential to Christianity. For severity of principles there were set up serenity, placidity of soul, equableness and moderation of views, a large and calm tolerance of all opinions, based on the assumption that there was nothing

in the realm of thought but opinions, and that the correct thing was to have only such as were lovely and beautiful.

The doctrines of Plato are, indeed, reconcilable with Christianity, which can always find some truth, some utility in every human philosophy. This reconciliation was once executed by the Christian fathers—Saints Gregory of Nazianzum and Gregory of Nyssa, Saint Basil the Great, Saint John Chrysostom, and others, men of sincere and enlightened faith. It could not be repeated by the Byzantine Greeks of the Renaissance, who were only too often infidels at heart, scandalized by the success of Mohammed, and still oftener libertines in conduct and principle. Nevertheless, a holy and learned cardinal like Bessarion, a mystic gentle priest like Marsilio Ficino, and a multitude of men like them, did believe that the divine Plato was as another Messiah, and that his refined and superior naturalism could somehow be the bridge over which the modern world would go into the fold of Jesus Christ. It was an excusable error, but a profound error, and its influence on all after civilization of Europe has been incalculable.

All these new influences were intimately related to the *primum mobile* of Italian life—the fine arts. Architecture, painting, sculpture and music, were true educators at all times of the Italian soul, very susceptible and plastic, particularly open to external influences. In this the Italians differed little from other peoples who live beneath a cloudless sky, in a land of perpetual sunshine, amid the charms of a bounteous and smiling nature.

Italy had never heartily adopted the Gothic architecture. The soft and even climate called for broad open and light-some spaces, while the clear and cultivated genius of the people was opposed to the dim uncertain lines and the semi-darkness of the Northern Gothic. They adopted, indeed, such details as were compatible with florid ornamentation—the pointed arch, the window of colored glass. But the so-called Gothic churches of Italy are always more Romanesque than Gothic, seldom if ever the nicely poised and balanced framework that rises like a perfect problem in calculus. Even these small concessions to the mediæval spirit were soon withdrawn.

The architecture of the Italian Renaissance becomes frankly pagan. The unfinished churches of their Middle Ages, and they were many, are often completed after the style of a pagan temple. Everywhere there is absolute symmetry of level lines, cold unrelieved plain surfaces, perfect proportions of columns and stories—a bookish architecture with little or no free-ranging personality. Who are now the builders? It is no longer the strong spiritual bishop rousing his people to raise before the world a fitting temple for the God of all natural beauty. It is the merchant who builds a small but perfect palace within a reasonable time, the despot who enlarges his modest shop and converts a square or two into a fortified but elegant camp, the brigand who calls on the scholar to make his stony crags impregnable, the epicure who retires from a jarring and rude-mannered world to enjoy a life of natural comfort in an elegant villa amid flowers and birds and sunshine, in the company of cultured men and women. Italian humanity, in its upper classes, is disenchanted of the great mediæval spell of vigorous expanding proselytizing Catholicism, and the new temper is shown at once in the new architecture that is of the earth earthy. It is not a little striking that the noble treatise of the Roman Vitruvius on architecture should have been discovered and edited by Poggio, one of the most immoral men of the Renaissance. This new architecture lends itself everywhere to richness and elegance, in the decoration of doors and windows, in the objects of furniture. Everywhere the ornaments of antiquity return to use—the egg and dart, the scroll, the trailing vine, the scenes of the harvest. The churches are vast galleries of pretty and tempting art-works, repetitions of the salons of the nobles. The bell-towers of the Middle Ages, picturesque and rugged, disappear; the exterior walls of the churches are white or yellow-washed. Most of the traces of the mediæval life and spirit vanish—as a rule of course unconsciously. It was a new spirit, a new atmosphere that was abroad. Architecture became a thing of the schools, a science of rules and precepts as solemn as the laws of the Medes and Persians. This was largely the work of the Latin and Greek scholars, the men known as Humanists, from the

word *Humanitas* or *Humaniores literæ*, meaning civilization, refined literature and the like. It was an unfortunate thing that deep in the hearts of many of these men there reigned a positive antipathy to the ideals and tenets of Christianity—hence all its peculiar monuments must be decried. New ideas must have a new setting, or rather, the old ideas must be clothed again in the old forms.

We must not believe that all this love of classical learning, this devotion to the fine arts, was a sudden growth. The splendid works of the fifteenth century in painting and sculpture were no more a sudden blossoming than the architecture of the period. Since the time of Giotto and the Pisani, the observation of nature and the perfection of technical skill in drawing, coloring, draping, landscape, decorative ornament, had been growing. There were regular schools for all the arts, notably the workshops of such wonderful Italian cathedrals as Pisa and Orvieto and Florence that were never quite finished—so vast were the ideas of their builders. We know now that the Italian painters had been learning much from the artists of Flanders and Burgundy—the handling of light and shade, the art of painting in oils—a revolution that threw out of daily or domestic use the fresco and the painting on wood, and made popular the canvas painting. Engraving on wood and copper multiplied the best work and enriched the artist. The painter is now as intensely popular as once the singer of love and war. He is yet a plain man of the people and bears always a popular name, often a nickname. No matter what his subjects are, he introduces the local landscape, let us say of Tuscany or Umbria, the local personages and customs. In the human figure the old conventionalism disappears and the portrait takes its place—in a word, we have a Christian realism in painting. At Siena there lives on a remnant of the deeply pious old school, the school of calm and serene adoration and contemplation that has left us the sweet evangel of San Geminiano. But throughout Tuscany, beginning with Florence, it is different. Living portraits, domestic landscapes, local traits of daily life, real houses and castles, unique and lovely ornaments based on flowers of the field and the lines of nature

herself—the individual experiences of the painter—are in every picture. The prophets lose their nimbus or halo, the apostles are figures of men on the street, the women are the mothers, sisters, sweethearts of the painters. Some few traces of that stern law of early Christian painting that fixed every type and made it obligatory live on. Thus, the Last Supper, the Madonna and Child, for the composition and disposition of figures, are the same as you may see in the Catacombs at Rome. But Leonardo da Vinci is said to have walked the streets of Milan for ten years looking for a suitable Head of Christ to put in his great masterpiece. The living model came into use—it would have been an abomination to the severely moral and mystic soul of the mediaeval painter. Painting was, indeed, yet in the service of the Church. But it was seeking new objects, ancient history and pagan mythology. Here came in the influence of the book-men, the Greek and Latin scholars. Through them the painting, or rather the sculpture and architecture of antiquity, revived and were cultivated. They lectured on the beauty of them, praised every new find, wrote daily on the absolute inimitable perfection of what the Greeks and Romans did, said, and were. Consciously or unconsciously those teachers, whether in university hall or city market-place, or in the palaces of the nobles, perverted the simple genuine Christian life of many an Italian town. The thousand years of the Middle Ages became a long dismal blank—its monuments like its writings were to their mind without true style, without perfection of form, therefore bad and worthy of eternal oblivion.

Of course, the local domestic origin of much Italian painting kept up always the religious life. A multitude of the noblest works of the great masters of the fifteenth and even the sixteenth centuries was produced for village confraternities—banners, altar-pieces; another multitude was made for individuals. Every lady wanted a Madonna in her little oratory, and it must be by the best painter of the time. The workshop of a Perugino or a Raphael was crowded with orders from all Italy. Raphael is said to have painted with his own hand, or designed and begun, nearly three hundred Madonnas.

Every family of importance had an altar in the parish church or in some church of the monks or friars, and it had to be decorated by the finest talent they could secure. Then there were the "Laudi," the village processions, and the "Mysteries"—the real origin of our theatres. All their forms of outdoor life called for images, painted compositions, and the most famous painter did not disdain the gold pieces that he got from humble village-folk for these designs. The intense rivalry of popular Italian life compelled him to produce something new and lovely each time, and in this way furthered constantly the perfection of such work.

Thus, the natural genius, the climate, the history, the monuments of antiquity, the language of the Italians, and their unbroken residence on the soil since the remotest times—all conspired to create an incredible number of the loveliest works of art, and to make Italy one great gallery of the fine arts.

In the fifteenth century were finished, to a great extent, the buildings begun in the thirteenth. Milan, Orvieto, Siena, Pisa, gave the new classical temper a chance to overshadow the spirit of the Middle Ages in façades, windows, decoration and sculpture that consciously depart from the spiritual beliefs and ideals of the men who planned and partly executed these great works. The new skill in drawing, both outline and perspective, and in foreshortening, permitted a more grandiose kind of frescoing. And when the scholars of Squarcione at Padua, like Andrea Mantegna, were given such a work as the T palace of Mantua to build, they reproduced antiquity along every line as far as they were able. They did not have it all their own way—a Fra Angelico and a Fra Bartolommeo, and many another famous painter, still clung to the inward and ideal spiritual beauty, the expression in each face of tender sentiments of piety, divine adoration, love, humility, gratitude. After the great triumphs of the fifteenth century the genuinely Christian sculptor grew rarer, driven out of business by the glorious models of antique art that were being daily dug up, and by the popular admiration for these models that sinned in many ways against the delicacy of the Christian conscience. When finally the old Saint Peter's was thrown down and the vast modern basilica

was planned and begun, the genuine Christian architecture, and with it of course the other arts, suffered a humiliation from which they are only beginning to recover.

A curious feature of the Italian Renaissance is the fact that many of its painters sculptors and architects were goldsmiths or apprentices of goldsmiths. The Italian goldsmith of the time was in reality, very often, the chief man of science in the town. We must remember that there was as yet no sharp distinction in artistic work—the true artist was able to turn his hand to sculpture as well as painting, to engraving on copper as well as to writing down the principles and practice of all these arts. So the goldsmith had to know many secrets of chemistry and the treatment of the precious metals, he had to be an architect for designing of reliquaries and an engraver for the inscriptions and fine ornamentation, a worker in mosaic and therefore a painter; a good ironsmith too, for he often had orders of a bulky nature. His shop, like the traditional shoemaker's shop, was the rendezvous of the chief citizens; his lovely masterpieces were on their tables and in their halls.

So a Verrocchio, a Pollajuolo, a Ghirlandajo, a Francia, were either apprentices of goldsmiths or goldsmiths themselves. It is also of some interest to know that most of the great artists of the fifteenth century were of poor and humble origin. It is a significant commentary on the truism that the real goods of life are not moneys, lands, revenues, but the fruits of the mind and the heart—education and religion. Who knows or who cares, except some dustman or scavenger of history, about the rich bankers of Augsburg, the wool merchants of Florence, the public carriers of Venice? With their wealth they wrote a line upon the sands of time that the next wave obliterated. But the names of the great artists shine forever in their masterpieces and echo forever above the great procession of humanity. Their very names to-day are a golden mine for Italy, since from every quarter of the world they draw thither an increasing multitude of men and women. Giotto was a shepherd, and like him Andrea Mantegna tended sheep. Fra Bartolommeo was the son of a carter. Leonardo da Vinci,

Bruno
official
much
who g
sador
gets v
fine fo
deep
rhetor
serve
as sol
ideals
in pu
form,
their
his la
led th
But v
dawn

Af
sance.
the po
only t
tude
form
ment
the id
is said
media
Renai
do no
popul
look a
super
the E
nowis
fluen
cathed

Brunellesco, and Michael Angelo were the sons of humble officials. They were all, or nearly all, poorly enough paid, and much less esteemed than the pompous Latinists and Grecists who got all that was going in the shape of fat offices, ambassadorships, public junkettings and the like. Society usually gets what it pays for—in those days it admired too much the fine forms of antiquity, that were as empty then as now of any deep moral value, and it got in return fine words and elegant rhetoric. But these were very hollow things and failed to preserve the popular liberties of the Italian republics that were as solid as a rock so long as the people held to their mediæval ideals. While the people of Florence, for example, went off in pursuit of mere earthly beauty, in language and color and form, the chains of a long slavery were being forged against their awakening. With his banquets and his songs, his wit and his lasciviousness, his manuscripts and his jewels, Lorenzo led the people out of their mediæval roughness and rawness. But when these *noctes cœnæque deûm* were over, came the dawn of a cruel and debasing slavery.

After all, Florence is the typical city of the Italian Renaissance. It is true that many of her greatest artists worked for the popes at Rome, and that Saint Peter's and the Vatican are only too thoroughly Renaissance work. It is true that a multitude of Roman churches owe their erection or their present form and ornament to this period. It is also true that government and administration were highly colored in that city by the ideals and the temper of the Renaissance. But, when all is said, it remains true that the City of Rome is primarily a mediæval city, and only in a secondary way a city of the Renaissance. Its art is at Rome an importation, the citizens do not give their children to it, it has nowhere a common popular character. There is no wild surging of the masses to look at the last masterpiece of Donatello, no submission of superb plans and designs to the taste of the mob. Thus, while the Eternal City wears the livery of the Renaissance, it is nowise true that it was the *foyer*, the living center of its influence. That was always Florence. There the slowly rising cathedral, the baptistery, the bronze doors of Ghiberti, the pri-

vate fortress-palaces of the Pitti, the Strozzi, the Rucellai, the statues of San Giorgio, the masterpieces of the Loggia, the Greek philosophers and infidels, the Latin orators and critics, the gabby farceurs, the della Robbia, a Filippo Lippi, a Benozzo Gozzoli, a Domenico Ghirlandajo, are all contemporary, all at home beneath a sky and amid a nature that seemingly are made for them. For us moderns they have been made to live again by John Addington Symonds, by Perrens, Villari, Monnier, and by the incomparable "vision" of George Eliot. Rome, Naples, Milan, Venice, and countless minor cities, have each their immortal works, their glorious names that enthuse from generation to generation all lovers of the beautiful. Each of these cities has its own significance in the history of the human mind in the West. Each was in its way a schoolroom of our education. But Florence is the great university of the Renaissance, where its materials are piled up, where its professors were trained, where its lessons were long and regularly taught, where its philosophy worked out most easily all its purposes and problems. Here, above all, its spirit was always at home, a supreme and masterful spirit of free affectionate surrender to the claims of beauty, regardless of truth and morality, as though beauty were to itself a higher law and its service some unshackled esoteric form of religion, sole worthy of the chosen spirits to whom are revealed its infinite grace proportion and harmony. Here, long before Luther and Calvin, was reached the real parting of the ways, the Pythagorean letter of crucial import, the conscious divorce of the senses and the soul, with a rigid resolution to walk in the chosen path whithersoever it finally led.

Already the soul of Christian Italy was called on to accept the noted formula: *Amicus quidem Plato, sed magis amica veritas.* It is a long cry from Pius II (Aeneas Silvius) to Saint Pius V, but in that fateful century there went on such a fierce and relentless probing of hearts and consciences throughout the peninsula as had never been seen since the days of Augustus. Unexpectedly men came upon the scene who hewed judgment to the line and hung the plummet of righteousness. And when their work was done the astonished

the
ties,
i, a
npo-
eem-
been
rens,
orge
minor
mes
the
the
way
uni-
up,
long
most
its
t of
illless
gher
rion,
l its
fore
ays,
orce
in the

cept
nica
) to
such
naces
the
cene
t of
shed

world confessed that there was yet a heart of oak in the old mediæval burg of Catholicism, that it could rise, stern and uncompromising, from an hour of dalliance and indolence, that it was not unworthy of its immemorial right of leadership, that it was able to cope as successfully with the insidious revival of the paganism of Libanius and Symmachus as it had with the paganism of Frederick II, that it knew itself always for the living responsible conscience of Catholicism which had never yet implored from it in vain the key-note of harmony or the bugle-call of resistance unto death, and that with native directness it saw far and clearly into the nature and course of the incredible revolution that was sweeping away all Northern Europe.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

THE COMPARATIVE METHOD IN LITERATURE.

Of all critics, Voltaire was the narrowest and most incapable of appreciating the methods of comparative literature. He was almost ready to say, with LeClerc—"The English have many good books; it is a pity that the authors of that country can write only in their own language." And yet narrow, even to classical bigotry, as he was, regarding all literature that was not a French imitation of Greece and Rome, he admits the continuity, the relativity, the world-wide power of literature when he says—"There are books that are like the fire on our hearths—we take a spark of this fire from our neighbors, we light our own with it; its warmth is communicated to others, and it belongs to all."

The business of the student of literature is to trace the pedigrees of books, as well as to compare books with books. And this comparison, this power of tracing implies in its result both concentration and expansion. Every book has its pedigree; and the ancestors of books, like the ancestors of persons, cannot be uprooted from the soil in which they grew; they are of their climate, of their time. As the bit of tapestry from a far-off Turkish palace carries the scent of the attar of roses to distant lands and through many changing years, so the book—one of a line of books—mingles with the current of thought, long after it is forgotten, in the life of an alien nation. Joseph Texte, in his "Etudes de Littérature Européenne," says: "A literature no more than an animal organism grows isolated from neighboring nations and literatures. The study of a living being is in a great part the study of the influences which unite it to beings near it and of the influences of all species which surround us like an invisible net-work. There is no literature," he continues, "and perhaps no writer, of whom it can be said that the history confines itself within the limits of his own country. How can the evolution of German literature be understood, without knowing the reasons for the acceptance on the part of German writers of the French influence, and

then of its rejection for the English influence? The history of the influence of Shakespere in Europe would, of itself, be an essential chapter in the history of modern literature. Romanticism is primarily an international event, which can be explained, as George Brandes says, only by the inter-relations of various literatures." The sentimental romanticism of Goethe, as evident in "The Sorrows of Werther," is due to the same influence that made "La Nouvelle Héloïse" of Rousseau, and made Sterne's "The Sentimental Journey"; but before Rousseau we find that other sentimentalists, the Abbé Prevost, whose book, "Manon Lescaut," was the predecessor of "Paul and Virginia." Voltaire, as everybody knows, owed much of his worst quality to the English Bolingbroke. In his serious works we find English Deism served with the *esprit Gaulois*; in the others where wit and bitter cynicism play like infernal lightning, we find Rabelais changed, and yet the same. "It seems, finally," to quote from Joseph Texte again, "that the literature of the modern epoch—and perhaps of all epochs—neither develops nor progresses without imitating or borrowing: imitation of antique, as in France, in the seventeenth century—borrowing from neighboring literatures, as in Germany, in the eighteenth. It is necessary, in order to make original works germinate, to prepare the soil with the *débris* of other works."

The student of literature, then, ought not to attempt to take one book and isolate it from its fellows. The beauty and freshness and humor of Chaucer may be enjoyed whether we go back to the trouvères for the sources of his earlier works, or trace the effects of Dante and Petrarch on those later in life; but for the broadening of the mind, for the perception of that sense of continuity so necessary for the knowledge of God's guidance in history, for the value of literature as a method of discovering the meaning of laws, it is well that Chaucer should be studied as a link in a chain. And yet not only as a link in a chain, but as a link in a chain running, as it were, through a closely knit coat of mail, touching and binding a hundred other links, large and small, without which the glittering garment of knighthood would be incomplete.

It deepens pleasure to know the relations of books to one another. It makes the study of literature easier, for it softens that feeling of desperation which strikes the reader when he enters a teeming library. Where shall he begin? How shall he hew a line through this wilderness of books? The genealogy of the book he loves will help him to do this, and its posterity will further assist in the work. Further to put the study of the pedigrees of books on higher ground, who speaks the word comparison, with the object of discovering truths, speaks the word science. "If the history of literature," as Joseph Texte remarks, "does not constitute an end in itself, if it aims, like all researches worthy of the name of science, at certain results which are at present beyond it, if it assumes, in fine, to be a form of the psychology of races and men, the comparative method imposes upon it the necessity of regarding the study of one type of men or of one literature as only an approach to a study more worthy to be called scientific."

There are many reasons, then, why books should be studied comparatively. The mere investigation as to whether one book is an imitation of another is not so important or vital as the analysis of beauties that have stimulated greater beauties in another book. No reader will say that Plutarch and Shakspere resemble each other. The Greek was a prose narrator, greatest in his way; the Englishman was a dramatic poet, greatest in his way; and yet the influence of Plutarch on "Julius Cæsar" and "Coriolanus" is unmistakable. It is as plain as the influence of the Byzantines on Giotto, or that of Wagner on the later manner of Verdi, or of Pindar on the English ode of the eighteenth century. Mangan and Poe seem to have no close relationship. As a rule, we do not think of them together, and yet it is difficult, after reading these poets, who evidently held peculiar and sensuous theories about poetry, to believe that Poe did not conscientiously imitate Mangan. And the German influences on Mangan are easily traced. How much Gælic meters affected him, it is not, unfortunately, possible for me to say.

To return to Shakspere: I once asked a friend of mine who loved only a few books, why he kept the maxims of Epic

tetus, the Roman slave, so near the plays of Shakspere, who was more than any Roman patrician. He simply turned to a line out of Hamlet: "For there is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so." "That is from Epictetus," he said, "and the more I study Shakspere's philosophy, the more I find Epictetus." And so the little volume held its place beside the many books of Shakspere's plays, and further examination convinced me that it had reason to be there.

Emerson, to come from the reign of Nero and Elizabeth to our own time, owes much to Epictetus, but more to Plato and Montaigne. He was not an imitator but an assimilator; to his philosophy we owe little, but to his power of stimulating idealism much. Emerson reflects Plato and Montaigne and his New England skies at the same time. His Plato is not the Plato of the groves and the white temples, but Plato touched by the utilitarianism of the cotton factory; his Montaigne is not the gay and polite and witty and pensive Montaigne, content with his books and his Burgundy, but a restless Montaigne, frost-bitten by Puritanism, become oracular because his auditors were too busy to contradict him.

If you compare the four essays on "Friendship"—Cicero's, Montaigne's, Bacon's, Emerson's, you will find the man Emerson, surrounded and affected by the shades of his literary ancestors. If you examine his bumps, after the manner of the discredited practices of phrenology, you will find that they are all of the American type; but you will find, too, that the influences of his literary ancestors has, in its old-worldly way, corrected the indications which the bumps show. He is composite; and the study of the types that enter into his make up will give a clue to the methods that ought to be used in the comparative study of other authors, who are all composite.

Voltaire says that nearly everything in literature is the result of imitation. But Voltaire was as deficient in desire and the power of real comparison as any of the Romans or Greeks. He was the slave of conventions; and was almost as rigid as that literary *sans culotte* who, in 1794, refused to save a victim from the guillotine because his petition had not been put into

classical language. If Voltaire has said that everything great in literature is largely the result of assimilation, he would have been much nearer the truth. There are those who call Tennyson classical, in the sense of coldness and symmetry; yet it can be easily shown that one of his most influential literary ancestors was Byron, who can be called neither cold nor classical. In fact, if any poet is romantic—and sentimentally romantic—Byron is that poet. In "Locksley Hall" and "Maud," there is the Byronic note, without the depths of Byronic despair. Tennyson's hopes and ideals are infinitely higher than Byron's in the first part of "Locksley Hall," and the passion infinitely purer in "Maud." In the second part of "Locksley Hall" the impetuous boy who felt that the world had come to an end when Byron dies, had disappeared in the old man whose hopes in the "Christ to come" through science and the new social order, had completely gone out. Tennyson's poetry has a long pedigree; and there are many quarterings on its coat of arms—among the heraldic colors is the vert of Wordsworth as well as the flaring vermilion of Byron; but there is one especially that cannot be expressed by any feudal tinct, and another that may be symbolized by many. The first it Theocritus; the second, Sir Thomas Malory.

From the first, Tennyson borrowed the title of the greatest of modern epics, "The Idylls of the King." And the influence of Theocritus, the sweetest of all pastoral singers is found everywhere, but most of all in "Enone." Theocritus, who was an ancestor of Vergil and of all later pastoral poets, takes new life in Tennyson. Even the English verse translations of this singer of the reed and the cyprus and of the contest of the shepherds in the green pastures can not wholly shut his beauty from our view. It is as hard to endure his artificial image as set up by Pope as it is that of Chancer as regilded by Dryden. Even Mrs. Browning handles his exquisite idyls with a touch that does not fit the violet of the spring. In prose translations some of the aroma escapes, but enough of it remains to cheer the soul with loveliness. To read him in youth is never to forget him. For Theocritus was the poet of nature, the inventor of the little idyls-pictures of town or country—

that singer of idyls who, nearly three hundred years before Christ, saw dimly nature's God.

"And from above," he says in the seventh *eidulla*, "down upon our heads were waving to and fro many poplars and elms; and the sacred stream hard by kept murmuring, as it flowed down from the cave of the nymphs. And the fire-colored cicadas, on the shady branches, were toiling at chirping; while, from afar off, in the thick thorn-bushes the thrush was warbling. Tufted larks and gold-finches sang, the turtle-dove cooed; tawny bees were humming round the fountains; all things were breathing the incense of very plenteous summer and of fruit-time. Pears fell at our feet, and apples were rolling for us in abundance, and the boughs hung in profusion weighed down to the ground with plums."

The warmth of the summer is in Theocritus. The gold and purple bees float in the dry down of the thistle, and Demeter's symbols, the spikes of corn and poppies, glow golden and scarlet in the soft Sicilian air. Tennyson, too, gives the color of the summer and the incense of the autumn, in symbols suggested by the Syracusan. And, from the refrains of Theocritus, he borrows, as Poe borrows from Mangan, the cadence of his music.

Edmund Clarence Stedman, in "The Victorian Poets" has some pregnant chapters on the resemblance of Theocritus and Tennyson, and his passages showing how Theocritus vitalized the English poet as a bee vitalizes a flower are culled with exquisite insight and taste. Among these, Mr. Stedman quotes the delicious appeal of Cyclops to Galatea (in the XI Idyl), to compare it with the passage in Book VII of "The Princess"—

"Come down, O maid, from yonder mountain height;
What pleasure lives in height, (the shepherd sang),
In height and cold, the splendor of the hills?"

There is the echo of the Sicilian summer, in "The Gardener's Daughter"—

"All the land in flowery squares
Beneath a broad and equal-flowing wind,
Smelt of the coming summer,—
From the woods
Came voices of the well-contented doves.
The lark could scarce get out his notes for joy,

But shook his song together, as he neared
His happy home, the ground. To felt and right
The cuckoo told his name to all the hills;
The mellow ouzel fluted in the glen;
The red-cap whistled; and the nightingale
Sang loud as though he were a bird of day."

"Enone," with the pathetic refrain, suggested by both Theocritus and Moschus, could not have existed in its present form, had not the Syracusan sung amid the hyacinth and arbutus.

In the black letter of Sir Thomas Malory, Tennyson read many times, until his mind and heart were steeped in the wonder of the old stories; and from the Elizabethan poets, who had learned much from their Italian brethren, he borrowed the allegory and added it to the tales of Sir Thomas. Spenser himself, following Ariosto,—for Ariosto is the chief literary ancestor of Spenser—had made an allegory. Tennyson strung the many colored gems of Sir Thomas on the silver string of his veiled meaning. Or, rather as he told his tales, the beads of his allegory slipped through his fingers. But the stories of the knights were greatly changed by the modern poet. Arthur is not, in "The Idyls of the King," the terrible monarch of fire and blood of Sir Thomas Malory. Another age and other manners have softened the chivalric compromises of the earlier times—for chivalry seems to have been a series of compromises with an ideal in the distance. The Arthur of Sir Thomas Malory is not the saintly King of Tennyson's imagination. In Malory's "Morte d'Arthur," he does and says things very inconsistent with the ideal, blameless king we love and revere in the "Idyls." And the allegory which Tennyson wove cannot be read into the rough doings of Arthur's knights. Nor did Sir Thomas, or the sympathetic Caxton who printed his book, see things as Spenser, Milton and Tennyson saw them—all these seeing differently according to the light of their time. But, if a book may be judged by its effects, the "Morte d'Arthur" does not deserve the condemnation of those Elizabethan Reformers, like Roger Ascham, who could excuse murder and adultery in an unrepentant real king, but

held up hands of horror at a mythical one, even when he repented.

"Herein," says the grand old printer, Caxton, in his preface to the "Morte d'Arthur," "may be seen noble chivalry, courtesy, humanity, friendlessness, hardiness, love, friendship, cowardice, murder, hate, virtue, sin. All is written for our doctrine, for to beware that we fall not into vice or sin, but to exercise and follow virtue, by which we may come and attain to good fame and renommé in this life, and after this to come unto everlasting bliss in Heaven; the which He grants us that reigneth in heaven, the Blessed Trinity. Amen."

"Ah, my Lord Arthur," cries Sir Bedevere, on the last day of the fight, "what shall become of me now ye go from me, and leave me here alone among my enemies?" "Comfort thyself," said the King, "and do as well as thou mayest, for in me is no trust for to trust in. For I will unto the vale of Avilion to heal me of my grievous wound. And if thou hear never more of me, pray for my soul!"

We can all recall the Homeric echo of this, in Tennyson's—

"The old order changeth, yielding place to new,
And God fulfils himself in many ways,
Lest one good custom should corrupt the world.
Comfort thyself: What comfort is in me?
I have lived my life, and that which I have done
May He within himself make pure! but thou
If thou should'st never see my face again,
Pray for my soul. More things are wrought by prayer
Than this world dreams of. Wherefore, let thy voice
Rise like a fountain for me night and day.
For what are men better than sheep or goats
That nourish a blind life within the brain,
If knowing God, they lift not hands in prayer
Both for themselves and those who call them friend?
For so the whole round earth is every way
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God."

"Now," says old Sir Thomas, when the roses have faded, "now we leave Guinever in Almsbury a nun in white and black, and there she was abbess and ruler, as reason would." How Tennyson refines upon this in the light of more cultured genius and finer days! You remember the simple little novice who sits at the sad queen's feet, and sings—

"Too late, too late, ye cannot enter now!"
They took her to themselves,"

Tennyson writes of the nuns and Guinevere—

"—and she
Still hoping, fearing, 'is it yet too late?'
Dwelt with them till in time their Abbess died;
Then she, for her good deeds and her pure life,
And for the power of ministration in her,
And likewise for the high rank she had borne,
Was chosen Abbess; there, an Abbess, lived
For three brief years; and there, an Abbess passed
To where beyond these voices there is peace."

It is the province of genius, as Emerson says, to borrow nobly. If the immediate ancestor of "The Idyls of the King" was the "Morte d'Arthur" as to matter, the remote ancestor was the "Idyls" of Theocritus as to form and manner. But I think it needs only time to show how many other prose writers and poets, how many changes of philosophies, customs, and point of view, it takes to make any writer who speaks to the soul with wisdom and to the heart with beauty. A poet descends from Heaven, step by step, like Jacob's angels on bars of celestial light. God only can create him and the Ancient of Days makes every hour from the beginning move towards his coming—and each poet is the father of another poet.

Tennyson was the child of Sir Thomas Malory and of his own time as Dante was of Vergil and of his time, as Milton was of the old Testament as interpreted by the rebels of his time, as William Morris was of Chaucer, accentuated by the tense romanticism of Dante Rossetti and the early Provencal poets.

Theocritus, Sir Thomas Malory, Tennyson! How near and yet how far apart! And comparatively, how many allied shades they recall! You mention the "Holy Grail," and up rise Spenser, Milton, Lowell—the Lowell of Sir Launfal—and then Wagner's Parsifal and spirit of beauty after spirit of beauty until the earliest of them seems to touch the very

seraphim. We can as easily leave out St. Thomas and St. Francis of Assisi in considering the genesis of Dante as we can consider any modern great work of literature without reference to its pedigree. Music, too, is closely bound to literature—the myth of Lohengrin is only a later version of that of Cupid and Psyche. Wagner could not have done what he did without the *Niebelungenlied*; nor Gounod, if the Middle Age legend of “Faust” had not been told from mouth to mouth, until Goethe, borrowing nobly from the Book of Job, made “Faust” vital and grandiose for all time. If culture means the broadening of the mind through the widest knowledge of the best, it is hard to see with what reason we can neglect the study of the pedigrees of books.

If Tennyson succeeded Wordsworth, Tennyson also succeeded Byron. While Wordsworth was serene, a painter of nature, Byron was the opposite of him. He was fiery, volcanic, furious, lurid, great in genius. He was popular, while Wordsworth, whom the world is now only beginning to acknowledge, was neglected; so that, strange as it may seem at first, Tennyson’s immediate predecessor was Lord Byron. Byron’s popularity was great while he lived. The hero of “Locksley Hall”—I mean the first part of it, for I think the second part is decidedly the better—is a Byronic hero, diluted. And the hero of “Maud” is of a similar type.

In “Locksley Hall” the hero sighs and moans and calls Heaven’s vengeance down on his ancestral roof because a girl has refused to marry him—because his cousin Amy marries another man, he goes into a paroxysm of poetry and denunciation and prophecy. But, as Shakespere says—“Men have died from time to time and worms have eaten them, but not for love.” And the hero of “Locksley Hall” lives to write a calmer style a good many years later. “Maud” showed, like “Locksley Hall,” something of the influence of Byron. After “Locksley Hall,” and “Maud” the effect of Byron on Tennyson seems to grow less.

The young Tennyson’s favorite poet was Thomson—he of the serene and gentle “Seasons.” Mrs. Ritchie tells us how very early the influence of Thomson showed itself.

"Alfred's first verses, so I have heard him say, were written upon a slate which his brother Charles put into his hand one Sunday at Louth, when all the elders of the party were going into church, and the child was left alone. Charles gave him a subject—the flowers in the garden—and when he came back from church little Alfred brought the slate to his brother, all covered with written lines of blank verse. They were made on the models of Thomson's "Seasons," the only poetry he had ever read. One can picture it all to oneself, the flowers in the garden, the verses, the little poet with waiting eyes, and the young brother scanning the lines. 'Yes, you can write,' said Charles and he gave Alfred back the slate."

The poet of Alfred's first love was the calm and pleasant Thomson we see. Later, as he grew towards manhood, he read Byron. He scribbled in the Byronic strain. How strong a hold Byron's fiery verse had taken on the boy's mind is shown by his own confession. When Alfred was about fifteen, the news came that Byron was dead. "I thought the whole world was at an end," he said. "I thought everything was over and finished for everyone—that nothing else mattered. I remembered I walk out alone, and carved 'Byron is dead' into the sandstone." Although "Locksley Hall" and "Maud" show Byronic reflections, yet they were not the earliest published of Tennyson's poems.

The Greek poet, Moschus, wrote an elegy on his friend, Bion, and the refrain of this elegy, "Begin, Sicilian Muses, begin the lament," is famous. Tennyson, this modern poet, possessed of the Greek passion for symmetry and influence almost as much by Theocritus, Moschus, and Bion, as by the spirit of his own time, has made an elegy on his friend as solemn, as stately, as perfect in its form as that of Moschus; but not so spontaneous and tender. There is more pathos in King David's few words over the body of Absalom than in all the noble falls and swells of "In Memoriam."

I doubt whether any heart in affliction has received genuine consolation from this decorous and superbly measured flow of grief. It is not a poem of faith, nor is it a poem of doubt; but faith and doubt tread upon each other's footsteps. Instead of the divine certitude of Dante, we have a doubting half belief. Tennyson loved the village church, the holly-wreathed bap-

tismal font, the peaceful vicarage, because they represent serenity and order. He detests revolution. If he had lived, before the coming of Christ, in the vales of Sicily, he would probably have hated to see the rural sports of the pagans disturbed by the disciples of a less picturesque and natural religion.

Keats could not have been Keats as we know him without Spenser. He is called Greek, but he knew Greek best through Chapman's Homer. Yet, he caught the spirit; and the form for him did not matter; he had that from the Epithalamium of Spenser; and "no poet," as M. Texte admits, "has excited more vocations to poetry than Spenser." He is, like Shelley, the poet for the poet. Other poets may speak to the world; he sings to the sacred city. He lacks the elevation of Spenser, deflected as it was, by the Elizabethan concession to the political spirit of his time; he is without the unconsciousness of the Greeks whose spirit he assumed without understanding it. He longed for sensations rather than thoughts, for dreams, rather than activities. He was romantic, if romance implies aspiration. The "Ode to the Nightingale" expresses Keats. He was half in love with "easeful death." He was not Greek in this; his neo-Hellenism is like the paganism of Swinburn—it cannot rid itself of the shadow of the Cross; it is black against the light of the Resurrection. Like Maurice de Guérin, he loved the pleasure of sensation, and the fact that they must pass filled him with fear. He turns to the immortal figures on the Grecian Urn with wild regret;—all, in life that has life, dies—only the work of the artist who uses inorganic stuff for his material lives. He felt, indeed, that his name was writ in water before Shelly made that splendid epitaph! "Endymion" is a poem of shadows in the moonlight. It is not Greek, but it is touched by the spirit of Greece.

It is romantic because it bears everywhere the burden of the poet's longing. "A joy forever" he longs for; but all joys pass as the moon passes and the shades of beauty with it. Keats is a neo-Grecian, if you will; his literary ancestors are the gods of the rivers and the woods, as Greek singers made them; but he is nearer to Ovid than to Theocritus, nearer to

Vergil than to Bion, and nearest of all to this time—which, under the influence of sir Walter Scott and Byron was the time of longing for light and color and glow and beauty that should be eternal. He, in his turn, had influenced many. When we speak of the Pre-Raphaelites we imply the name of Keats. “The Earthy Paradise” of William Morris presumes the influence of Chaucer; but who can read from “The Earthy Paradise,” without thinking of Keats

“Of Heaven or Hell I have no power to sing,
I cannot ease the burden of your fears,
Or make quick coming death a little thing,
Or bring again the pleasures of past years,
Nor for my words shall ye forget your tears,
Or hope again for aught I can say,—
The idle singer of an empty day.”

What we call the Puritanism of Spenser was, on its spiritual side, the eclipsed light of the Catholic years that has passed; it sustained him—for he was the son of Ariosto and of Truth and Beauty. And the Puritanism of Milton—of the mind, not of the heart—while it vitiated his Christianity, did not subdue his Hebraic elevation. Keats, the poet of earthly beauty, had the feeling of the Greek for the sensations of life, but he was oppressed by the fear that a day would come when he and life must part. Heine, a great lyrist, too (he was Greek by turns, less sublimated than Keats) stood old, almost blind, paralyzed, at the foot of the statue of Venus of Melos, in the Louvre. And the world seemed about to go to pieces, for the Revolution of '48 roared around him. The true Greek would have died, satisfied that he had lived his life. But Heine, who had lived for earthly beauty and joy, who was already dead because the pleasures of life were dead to him, cried aloud in despair. Earth could not give immortality! Of these neo-Greeks—not of the old Greeks, but touched by their spirit—was Keats.

The elegy of Theocritus for Daphnis has echoed ever since he called on the Sicilian muses to weep with him. If it, with the recurrent refrain of musical sorrow, touched Tennyson in

our time
the voice
immortal
elegy in
richness
name of
lime C
Collins
the mo
Greek
strophe
odes.
highest
Crashan
The
beginn

and wi
English
Pindar
pretatio
but Pat
Pindar
who fa
music o
jumpin
“Each
its own
own fo
called I
individ
talists i
The pe
able su
incongr

The

our time to sing of the dead Hallam, it spurred Milton to raise the voice of music over Lycidas and Shelley to consecrate the immortal Adonais to Keats. The pedigree of the English elegy is as easily traced as that of the English ode, with whose richness our literature actually blazes. The Pindaric ode is a name of horror in English, since a slavish imitation of the sublime Greek distorted some of the finest odes of Gray and Collins. The spirit of Pindar helped to make the English ode the most beautiful in all the world, but the attempt to give Greek form to our verse has almost ruined, by meaningless strophes and antistrophes, some of the loveliest of English odes. I need only indicate the pedigree of the ode at the highest by mentioning three sublime names,—St. Teresa, Crashaw, Coventry Patmore.

The raptures of St. Teresa inspired Crashaw with the ode beginning—

“ Love, thou art absolute sole lord
Of life and death,”

and with that other ode, less dignified because its form is an English imitation of the exquisite ever-changing music of Pindar which can only be transmitted into our tongue by interpretation. Pindar influences the form and St. Teresa the spirit; but Patmore is touched by Crashaw and not at all by the form of Pindar, though he is nearer to Pindar than any of the poets who failed to see that each of his odes had a delicate shell-like music of their own which could not be expressed by a short jumping line thrown in here and there among the longer ones. “Each of the Odes of Pindar,” William Sharp says, “has its own music, as each conch stranded by the waves has its own forlorn vibration of the sea’s rhythm: whereas the so-called Pindaric Odes of Cowley and his imitators have no more individuality of music than have the exercises of instrumentalists in contradistinction to the compositions of musicians.” The pedigree of the Pindaric ode in English offers an admirable subject for the study of a beautiful form twisted into an incongruous shape by poets who blindly followed one another.

There can be no question that a comparative study of the

literature of the Japanese and the Italian, the Basque and the Teuton would make for cosmopolitanism, but who can speak of fixed literary laws which shall bear exact scientific analysis, without stretching the word "literary" so thin that it must break? Philosophy may be cosmopolitan or international—Christianity is universal; and if the whole world were Christendom—animated and active—there would be only one spirit in literature; but literature of itself must, until the world shall all be one way of thinking and feeling, be as varied as Milton's leaves in Vallombrosa—for no two leaves are exactly alike, though they are all leaves.

Still, the value and beauty of literature are best studied by processes of comparison which may be called scientific. And these processes of comparison are rendered easier by the consideration of the pedigrees of books.

MAURICE FRANCIS EGAN.

HIS

In
Mediev
have th
English
Middle
of place
retrogr
prefato
historic
and of

No
known t
of roma
the pub
tireless
tions of
for the
seventee
Jesuits,
Waddin
Cossart,
antiquit

But
rare at
especial
the Mid

¹ Macr
could not
the source
compelled
consulted
April, 187
learned in
Hurter's H
in the intr
haustive b
National J
many item
of Hergen

HISTORIANS OF THE MEDIEVAL PAPACY.

In the second part of "Political Theories Ancient and Medieval," by Professor W. A. Dunning of Columbia,¹ we have the latest and in many respects the ablest exposition in English of the Protestant view upon papal politics in the Middle Ages. Before criticizing directly it will not be out of place to look backward in order to see how much advance or retrogression in historical science is marked by this book. Some prefatory remarks are therefore in order, as to the course of historical criticism in the study of the Middle Ages in general and of papal politics in particular.

No words need be wasted on the first point: As is well known the revival of interest in those ages came in on the wave of romanticism represented by Walter Scott, at least so far as the public was concerned. True! long before this a number of tireless workers were busy compiling their stupendous collections of documents which were to furnish the first materials for the student. No centuries boast abler discoverers than the seventeenth and eighteenth with their long list of Benedictines, Jesuits, secular clergymen and laymen. Such were Bollandus, Wadding, the Assemani, Mabillon, Muratori, Labbe, Coletti, Cossart, who labored so well on the councils, liturgy, national antiquities, etc.

But allowing for these the study of medieval history was rare at least on the part of the general reader. This was especially true of England. To Sir Philip Sidney (1554-1586) the Middle Ages were a "millennium of darkness," a "misty

¹ Macmillan, New York, 1902. In preparing this paper the present writer could not justly be expected to have read all the authors here criticized, nor have the sources of information been as accessible as he could wish. Thus he has been compelled to put down many statements on the authority of others. He has consulted very freely various articles in the *Dublin Review* (December, 1844, April, 1876, October, 1877, April, 1877, the last three particularly); also the learned introduction by M. Alex. de Saint Chéron to the French translation of Hürter's History of Innocent III (Paris, 1838); the critiques of church historians in the introductions to Alzog's and Hergenröther's general histories, and the exhaustive bibliographies added to each chapter in same. The "Dictionary of National Biography" and the "Biographie Universelle" of Michaud supplied many items of information. The same can be said of the able Catholic apologetics of Hergenröther ("Church and State") and Gosselin ("Power of the Popes").

time," "uncivil age hung with dust and cobwebs," a verdict that remained valid to the latter half of the eighteenth century. Then a change began, almost imperceptibly. Medieval architecture commenced to fascinate dilettanti of the type of Horace Walpole (1717-1797) and the poet Gray (1716-1771). Percy's Reliques published in 1765 likewise announced a change in sentiment. A more powerful impulse came from Germany in the shape of Goethe's first work "*Götz von Berlichingen*" in 1773, which aroused the enthusiasm of Walter Scott, to whom the Romantic movement in all its phases owes so much. Yet even this was largely unsympathetic. Scott and Wordsworth retained the old religious prejudices against the Middle Ages. This was yet to be overcome before these were to be studied with any degree of thoroughness. The renaissance of Gothic architecture under Pugin was not without its effect, nor again was the romantic movement in English literature quite foreign to the change. However, the latter was really accomplished by the Oxford movement with John Henry Newman as leader. The immediate results upon medieval history are well known to all readers of that master and of his friends and disciples, Church, Hurrell Froude, J. W. Bowden, Maitland, Kenelm Digby, Dalgairns, Dean Milman, Neale, Mrs. Hemans and Mrs. Jameson. Then began the publication of the Rolls Series in 1857 which made the medieval records of England accessible to a degree hitherto impossible, and raised the study of the past to its present high plane of thoroughness, as is evidenced in the works of James Bryce, Freeman, Stubbs, Haddan, Bishop, Stevenson and others. Much bitterness and not a little ignorance still exist, but the advance from Gibbon and Robertson to Bishop Stubbs and Mr. Bryce is astonishing. Nor are signs wanting that an equal advance will be made in the early years of the new century.

The story is pretty much the same for all Europe. The Oxford movement in England was but a local manifestation of this general turning towards medievalism. Its first effects in Italy are seen in the labors of Cesare Balbo (1789-1853), Cesare Cantù (living in 1898), Tosti, Capecelatro, Troja, Cibrario, etc. Germany adds such names as Pertz and Waitz,

Hurter, Phillips, Jaffé, Potthast, Leo, Hefele, Hergenröther, Voigt, Raumer and a host of others. Even irreligious and Gallican France responded to the impulses of Châteaubriand, and produced such writers as Montalembert, Rio, Guérard, Delisle, the two Thierrys, Ozanam, Ampère, Michélet, Lècuy de la Marche, Ménard, Pouchet, Huillard Bréholle, Guizot, etc. Despite such able works, however, France is even to-day perceptibly less sympathetic to things medieval than are Germany, Italy and even Protestant England. The reasons for this will be stated below.

In general then the advance in medieval studies is more than satisfactory despite the yet remaining prejudice. But the same cannot be said of the modern attitude towards that which is the very heart of medieval history—the Papacy. Enough prejudice exists even yet to seriously mar the very best treatises on those times. And let it be recorded with shame that this state of affairs is due as much to Catholics as to Protestants. One might almost be justified in asserting that it is due *chiefly* to Catholics of France.

If the Papacy to-day is the target for coarse abuse even in the pages of learned writers, the blame can be laid very largely at the door of Gallicanism. By Gallicanism is not meant a love of France which is the right and duty of all Frenchmen, as such being as admirable as any other nationalism whether Americanism or Italianism. But we mean a distinctively anti-papal spirit of historical criticism which from the time of and in the interest of that incarnation of royal despotism, Louis XIV, has infected pretty much all modern French historians, even the most Catholic, at least until well on into the nineteenth century. As a body they can be justly charged with an habitually unscrupulous treatment of papal history and of sacrificing the papacy whenever it withstood their monarchical absolutism. They originated and kept alive the most unworthy calumnies and allied themselves, even when Catholic, to that interminable list of free-thinking historians who have made of historical writing such a terrible instrument for the destruction of reverence for the Holy See. Their best excuse is that they after all have merely reechoed the anti-papal prejudices of writers contemporary with the popes of a past age.

The story is a long and a sad one. It begins in the Middle Ages itself, first with the tremendous conflict between the papacy and emperors like Henry IV, Frederic Barbarossa, Frederic II, and kings like Philip the Fair of France. For that struggle was fought out only with arms and diplomacy at Canossa, Anagni and Avignon, but as well with the pen by the legislist, canonist and publicist. The names of the protagonists may be seen in Otto Gierke's "Political Theories of the Middle Ages," as translated by Professor Maitland (Cambridge, 1900). Dante takes a partisan stand in the *Divina Commedia*. The popular histories like those of Martinus Polonus and Matthew Paris are colored with anti-papal prejudice. The very songs of the tavern and university reflect the same.¹ It becomes yet bitterer in the writings of Marsiglio of Padua, Oecam, Pierre Dubois and that crowd of brilliant but unscrupulous writers during the saddest age of the Church beginning with the Avignon residence and closing with the Council of Constance.

It was not to be expected that those countries which embraced Protestantism would give up their hatred for the medieval Popes—and so for almost three centuries after Luther they are given scant justice in Germany, England and any other Protestant country. But, as above noted, the shame of it is that they were given no more by French Catholic writers of the same period, so much so that it remained for Protestant writers, above all German, to render the Popes the justice so long denied them. M. Gosselin, a Frenchman himself, admits the truth of this statement in no equivocal terms in the conclusion of his admirable work² where he also indicates the fundamental cause of this anti-papal prejudice on the part of French Catholic writers "interested in supporting the cause of those *princes* who had incurred the anathemas of the Church." Only a cursory reading is necessary to find the one man to whom most of it is due. He is the famous Abbé Claude Fleury (1640–1723), friend and intimate of Bossuet, author of an otherwise admirable "Ecclesiastical History" termed by Voltaire the best of its kind ever written. Here then the genealogy of at least modern anti-papal history commences in France. True, Bossuet, his

¹ Cf. "Political Songs" ed. by Thos. Wright, Camden Soc., 1839.

² "Power of the Popes in the Middle Ages," Vol. II, pp. 357–358, cf. p. 307.

master, was no ultramontane, but his greater genius saved him from the grosser errors of the disciple.¹ Fleury, though imbibing much of his hostility from Bossuet, went far beyond him in vituperation of the great medieval Popes such as Gregory VII, Innocent III and of course Boniface VIII, the last opponent of French absolutism whether in church or state. Being a Catholic priest his views, presented with admirable style, and with superior narrative power, found way even more easily than those of the Protestant Centuriators of Magdebourg. They have held their own with comparative tenacity well into the nineteenth century, nor have yet completely disappeared.² Among the numberless French historians from his day to this, there are comparatively only a few exceptions to the general prejudice against the medieval popes.

Consider the long list of those who are anti-papal more or less. Voltaire (1694–1778) of course; Mézerai (*History of France*, 1643–1651); l'Abbé Velly (*History of France*, 1765–1785); l'Abbé Vertot (1655–1735); Lebeau (*Historie du Bas-Empire*, 1757); l'Abbé Millot (*Eléments de l'Histoire de France*, 1767; other works in 1774, 1772, 1796); Daunou (1761–1840) who wrote at Napoleon's command and in order to justify the latter's suppression of the papal Temporal Power his "*Essai historique sur la puissance temporelle des Papes*"; Capefigue (*Histoire de Philippe Auguste*, 1827–1829); Michelet (*Histoire de France*, 1833–1860); Sismondi (*Histoire des Républiques Italiennes au Moyen Age*, 1801; *Histoire des Français*, 1821–1844; *Littérature du Midi de l'Europe*, 1813) whose brilliancy has given such popularity to his venom; Count de Ségur (*Histoire de France*); Anquetil (*Histoire de France*, 1805, *Histoire Universelle*, 1797); A. Thierry (*Récits des Temps Merovingiens*, 1833–1837, *Considerations sur l'histoire de France*); Michaud (*History of the Crusades*, 1811); Guizot (1787–1874); Bernardi (1751–1824); Villemain (1790–1870), Henri Martin, Victor Duruy, and so on. All of them bear the hall-mark of Gallican dislike or suspicion of the Papacy whether they be downright irreligious like Daunou, Sismondi and

¹ Op. cit., II, 300–301.

² On Fleury see op. cit., I, 223; II, 134, 319. Also Hurter, *Introd.*, p. x–xiii.

Thierry or rationalist like Michelet, Capefigue, Guizot (fairest of them all) or really Catholic like Fleury.¹

Against this formidable array which, by the way, is far from complete the loyal Catholic reader can pit a mere handful of writers like De Maistre (*Du Pape*, 1819); Père Daniel, S. J. (*History of France*, 1713) who occasionally displays a Gallican spirit of unfairness;² M. De la Porte du Theil who in 1791 supplemented Baluze with the unedited letters of Pope Innocent III and inserted a careful and just memoir of the same pontiff in Vol. VI of his “*Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale et autres bibliothèques*; publiées par l’Institut National de France”; Châteaubriand (1768–1848); Montalembert (1777–1831); Christophe, Abbé Verlaque, O. Delarc, Léon Gautier, Ozanam, etc.—men whose works, we make bold to say, are more popular outside of than in France, whereas the works of anti-papal writers have received immense popularity in France where they are

“livrés entre les mains de la jeunesse, chez laquelle ils propagent les opinions les plus fausses sur les faits et les hommes de nos traditions religieuses et nationales . . . On réimprime chaque jour Mézerai, Anquetil, Velly, Millot . . . le Père Daniel instruit, exact, sage et vrai on le laisse dans l’oublié.”³

Nor is France alone to blame. German Catholic writers of the age of Joseph II, with a few exceptions like the Jesuit Joseph Pohl (1753) were all infected with the prevailing hostility towards the Popes, sharpened by not a little rationalism and coarsened by still more ignorance. Thus Dannenmeyer, Royco, Wolf, Michl, Schalfus, Stoeger, Becker, Gudenus, whose works were published variously from 1776 to 1811.

“D’historiographie ecclésiastique dans le sens élevé de ce mot, il n’y en avait point dans l’Allemagne Catholique de ce temps.” (Herrnröther’s “*Histoire de l’Eglise*,” Vol. I, p. 51.)

It was not until the appearance of Count Leopold von Stolberg’s “*History of the Religion of Jesus Christ*,” in 1806–1818,

¹ For a critique of these and other anti-ultramontane writers see Gosselin, I, pp. xv, xxvi, 223, 246, 287; II, 5, 6, 8, 12, 134, 307, 319, 326, 357–8; also Hurter, introd., pp. x–xiii; here we mention merely a few names at random as the list is too lengthy for a review article. Cf. also Gorini, “*Défense de l’Eglise*,” 2d ed., 1858.

² See Gosselin, II, 40, 44, 128, 239.

³ Hurter, pp. xvii, xxi.

that a better era commenced. The old prejudice still animated the works of such writers as Locherer (pub. 1824-1834) and Reichlin-Meldegg (pub. 1830), though the tide was turned back by Katerkamp (1819-1834), Döllinger (1833), Hefele, Hergenröther, Schwab and other recent writers (see Alzog, Vol. I, pp. 50-54). These writers and their loyal confrères in France have done much to put the Papacy in its true light, but it will take several generations to undo the harm by the above-mentioned Gallican and Josephist writers, if the harm is really ever to be completely undone, which we doubt. Of these men it is difficult to write calmly. Doubtless they were sincere, but an American Catholic finds in himself little sympathy for men who have sacrificed the papacy to a blind defence of royalty and its extravagant ecclesiastical pretensions.

The key to their anti-papal utterances is apparently not a love of church but of that royal absolutism represented by the Grand Monarque and voiced by its Court orator:¹ Words such as these make at least an American suspicious of their author's complaints against the ambition of the Popes who, whatever their faults, have been too democratic to accept any such apotheosis of royalty.

From this view at the anti-papal utterances of Catholic historians it is refreshing to turn to the consideration of fairer and abler Protestant historians, who, be it said to their credit, have, on certain lines, rehabilitated the medieval papacy so unjustly calumniated by its natural friends. Stranger still it is from Germany in particular, from the very land of the Hohenstaufen, that popes like Innocent III and Gregory VII have received their vindication. We should have expected the opposite, as it is but natural to presuppose that the memories of Canossa and Manfred and Barbarossa would have lingered forever as terrible legacies. But somehow or other the German loves the Middle Ages more than any other European. Perhaps it is so because he is more medieval even to-day than any other. At all events he has rehabilitated the Papacy with an indifference

¹ "L'autorité royale est absolue. Le prince ne doit rendre compte à personne de ce qu'il ordonne. . . Contre l'autorité du Prince il ne peut y avoir de remède que dans son autorité." (Words of Bossuet from his "La Politique tirée des propres paroles de l'Ecriture" quoted by Adolph Franck on p. 10 of "Réformateurs et Publicistes du dix-septième siècle.")

to religious prejudice which is highly creditable to his historical candor.

To Germany we owe the epoch-making histories of Gregory VII by Voigt (1815), of the Papacy by Leopold von Ranke (1834-1836), of Innocent III by Hurter (1833-1834), of Sylvester II by Hock, of the Crusades by Wilken (1823-1825), the "Apology of Pope Gregory VII" by Gaab (Tubingen, 1792) and "Vindication of Gregory VII" by the same (2 Vols., 1786), "Pope Gregory VII and his Age" by Gfrörer (Schaffhausen, 1859, sq., 7 vols.), "Lectures on German History" by John von Müller (see Vol. II), "History of the Constitution of Christian Ecclesiastical Society" by Planck (Hanover, 1806, 5 vols.) and a number of other works written almost entirely by Protestants which have done wonders in dissipating the prejudices against the medieval Papacy fostered by Catholic, Josephist and Gallican historians of the preceding age.¹

Following upon and partly accompanying these works there appeared a series of able and temperate works on the medieval papacy in other countries, both from Catholics and Protestants. Thus the "Storia di Bonifazio VIII" (1846) by Don Luigi Tosti of the Benedictine Order, the "Histoire de la Papauté au quatorzième siècle" (Paris, 1853) by the Abbé Christophe; the "Temporal Power of the Popes" by the Sulpician Gosselin (2d part pub. in 1839, 2 vols.); the "Défense de l'Eglise" by the Abbé Gorini; the "Grand Schisme d'Occident" by L. Salembier (1900); the splendid work on Gregory VII and the Reform of the Church by the Abbé O. Delarc (3 vols., 1889); "Grégoire VII" by Davin (Tournai, 1867); the monumental labors of Hefele on the Councils and Cardinal Hergenröther's masterly essay on "Church and State" (Eng. trans., 2 vols., London, 1876)—all witness to the fact that Catholics pretty generally in continental Europe have at last come to their senses and are striving to undo, if possible, the harm done the Church by the systematic misrepresentation of the medieval papacy in its relations to the civil power by the Gallican Catholic writers above mentioned.

¹ Of course even these works, as might be expected from the Protestant opinions of their authors, frequently state views with which most Catholics would disagree. For instance even Voigt and Hurter. See Gosselin, I, XXVII, 299; II, 21.

I
treat
of P
toric
certa
favo
"Lif
Greg
comp
Arch
caug
ping
cilio
of th
tiani
1855
tiona
Chu
liber
says
fairr
tract
tive
tione
stand
lish
most
on t
Fath
Seri
I
Rom
sover
in to
T
subj
well
—
243-4

In England also the tide is turning in favor of a more liberal treatment of the medieval popes and their polities at the hands of Protestants. To William Roscoe is it due. He is the historical antecessor of Voigt, Hurter, Hock and Ranke, being certainly the first English Protestant who dared to write a favorable biography of any pope. I refer, of course, to his "Life of Leo X" published in 1805, ten years before Voigt's Gregory VII appeared. In spirit and method it offered a complete revulsion from the unjust volumes of the ex-Jesuit Archibald Bower. Other succeeding Anglican writers have caught much of his spirit of fairness and are gradually dropping the philosophic sneer of Gibbon and the literary superciliousness of Hallam when writing of the Papacy, though much of the old leaven yet remains. Milman's "History of Christianity" (1840 and "History of Latin Christianity" (1854-1855) are good instances of ability marred by the traditional anti-papal prejudice. The "Lectures on Medieval Church History" by Archbishop Trench mark an advance in liberality; whilst Maitland's "Dark Ages" (1844) and "Essays on the Reformation" reach the very high-water mark of fairness. But English historians are not very generally attracted to medieval papal history. Hence there is a comparative dearth of works on that subject. To those above mentioned there are few to add. Among them very prominently stands the best and most complete life of Gregory VII in English by John William Bowden (London, 1840, 2 vols.). The most recent works in English are Father Mann's two volumes on the Popes of the Early Middle Ages (London, 1902) and Father Barry's "Papal Monarchy" (Story of the Nations Series).

Lastly coming to the very special questions of the Holy Roman Empire, of the political relations of Popes and temporal sovereigns, there does not seem to be very much advance either in tone or in research amongst writers in English.

The first writer of any note to write at any length upon the subject was Gibbon,¹ whose faults and virtues as a critic are well enough known to dispense with fresh comment. Suffice

¹ For a critique on Gibbon's treatment of papal history see Gosselin, I, 243-4, 291.

to note in this connection that he touches upon Papal history only as a side issue to his main subject of the Roman Empire in its decline. But, nevertheless, he has impressed his spirit upon all succeeding English writers as deeply as Fleury impressed his upon French historians. He is quoted extensively, by the very latest—Tout, Dunning, who are more or less poisoned with his scepticism. Even Father Barry speaks of Gibbon as “the mocking not unkindly sceptic”—an estimate which, to put it mildly, we are at a loss to comprehend.

But as Gibbon's monumental work was beyond the grasp of the general reader a continuous history of the Holy Roman Empire for English students was felt to be a necessity. This want was very inadequately met by Mr. James Bryce who published in 1864 his universally known “Holy Roman Empire.” It had many merits, was fairer in tone than Gibbon, was brilliant in style and reduced the subject to limits suitable for the general public. But its many defects prevented it from fully meeting the want. Besides being entirely too subjective in treatment it is almost hopelessly confused. The average reader wanders through it in pretty much the same condition of mind that he would blunder through a South African jungle. But, defective as it is, it has held its own even to the present writing as the best all-around history of the subject in English, having passed through many editions. This becomes all the more apparent when we consider the other works of a similar nature. In 1898 was published “The Medieval Empire” by Herbert Fisher (2 vols.). A scholarly production but even more disappointing than the preceding because it confines its attention solely to the German or Imperial side of the question. It should be entitled rather “The German Medieval Empire.” Mr. T. F. Tout's “Empire and Papacy” published in this same year might easily have superseded Bryce had the author not been compelled by his circumstances to stop at the year 1273, or had he even with this handicap inserted a chapter or two upon the early Papacy before 918 and upon the *theory* of the Holy Roman Empire. As far as it goes it is a decided improvement upon Bryce in every particular, above all in being objective in treatment and lucid in arrangement. Two other

volumes treat only of the theoretical aspects of the case somewhat in the fashion of essayists. Reference is made to the brilliant exposition of the theory of the "indirect power" of the popes over temporalities by Mr. William Molitor in his "Burning Questions" and to the essay in the *Contemporary Review* (February, 1876) by Sir George Bowyer entitled "Concordantia Sacerdotii atque Imperii," published afterwards in book form.¹ Both writers are, we believe, Catholic.

Two other remarkable books appeared in 1902. One on "Political Theories" by Mr. Dunning, the other above mentioned, by Dr. William Barry, entitled "The Papal Monarchy." Criticism of Father Barry's monograph is difficult. Perhaps the consciousness of his Catholicity embarrassed him in his work intended for a presumably non-sectarian (?) public. At all events his work touches only upon the political side of the Papacy, and even there confines itself, when possible, to Rome. It is even narrower in scope than Tout. Mr. Dunning's work, as its title implies, deals only with theories. So that, to sum up, it will be seen that there is no complete history of the Holy Roman Empire in English. It has been best treated in all its phases by Bryce, but his work is too manifestly defective to be final. There yet remains, perhaps, too much prejudice to allow of a complete and fair history philosophically planned and executed. At present we can only deal with particular aspects or phases of the mighty theme.

Such then is the present state of historical enquiry regarding the Medieval Papacy in its political relations. As Mr. Dunning has written by far the most pretentious and able work on his particular subject in English, a detailed examination of his work will serve the very useful purpose of showing the defects of historians in this branch and as well the means by which to avoid past mistakes.²

¹ Cf. *Dublin Review*, April, 1876.

² Our criticism confines itself to the controversial side. But in passing, one cannot avoid noticing how generally the author omits all reference to what we might call national polities and the theories which went *pari passu* with them, theories which existed though not enunciated in the same elaborate fashion as those affecting the Papacy and Empire; an omission all the more illogical as he says (p. xxv) that his object was to present only such theories which had a close "relation to political fact." Thus, for instance, in the famous song on "The Battle of Lewes" composed about the middle of the thirteenth century by an ardent champion of the popular cause led by Simon de Montfort we have

That we deal at such length with this book is ample warrant that we consider it a work of prime importance. From a point of view of both scholarship and fairness of at least tone it is an advance upon Gibbon and Bryce. The author, moreover, is evidently sincere. But there praise ends and an unwilling criticism begins. Despite its many excellencies there are the ancient ear-marks of hostility to the papacy, which mar an otherwise creditable work. Gibbon's influence is only too apparent. The reader will understand this better by a glance at the bibliography, because the character of the books habitually consulted by an author are a fair index of the bent of his mind. Of course, no author can be expected to supply an irreproachable bibliography especially when his subject is such a vast one as medieval politics. But, if a writer gives a list of books at all, he should at least not omit *systematically* many of the very best books upon his subject. And when a question is a controversy, as this one of medieval papal politics is, necessarily though unfortunately, common fairness would require a writer to mention and consult the best apologists on both sides. Mr. Dunning apparently has read but one side. In fact he seems to be ignorant or at least ignores almost entirely the many first-class works that present the papal position in a more favorable light. In the general bibliography he mentions, in almost a spasm of generosity, Pastor, Janssen, Mansi and one or two modern Catholic writers, but there they lie buried, Mansi and Janssen being quoted only twice in the special bibliographies. But not a word of that long list of able writers, both Catholic and Protestant, who have more or less defended the Papacy—Hergenröther, Hurter, Voigt, Bowden, Hefele, Philippus, Muratori, Ozanam, Vacandard, Christophe, Grisar, Tosti, Gosselin, Balbo, Baronius, Cantù, Hettinger, Gautier, Schwab, Von Reumont, etc. Whereas there is not omitted any

quite an elaborate discussion on the nature of kingship, right of rebellion, right of the people to representation, etc. Being composed in the very thick of the struggle for Parliamentary liberties at the critical period of English constitutional development it probably has had as much to do with "political fact" as any document quoted by Mr. Dunning. (See "Political Songs of England," ed. by Thos. Wright for the Camden Society, 1839.) Mr. Edward Jenck's "Law and Politics in the Middle Ages" (1898) is the very antithesis of the work here criticised. Disregarding all Imperial politics it goes to the heart of national law and custom, tracing with a lawyer's acumen the development of the state as such out of the clan and feudalism.

anti-pa
whose
difficul
criticis

No
of his
"Gen
the rel
a class
positio
enough
word i
But ne
is simp
VII b
of Inn
of Bo
learne
in sile
so fre
treatis
True,
works

So
specia
clearly
let us
and ty
during
others
Now w
tween

³ Co
writers
consult
röhler's
VII, p.
(French
of Lavis
(II, 199
are judg

² Fo

anti-papal writer of note, but many are inserted the titles of whose works the author must have found with considerable difficulty. The bibliography of texts is not included in this criticism.¹

Now these names above given stand in the very front rank of historians, above all Cardinal Hergenröther, author of a "General History of the Church" and an exhaustive treatise on the relations between "Church and State." This latter work is a classic; it is the most ample and learned defense of the papal position ever published. It has an apparatus of learning enough to satisfy the most exacting German professor. In a word it is par excellence the book from the papal point of view. But not a word about it has Mr. Dunning. Such an omission is simply inexcusable. Take some others. The lives of Gregory VII by Voigt and Bowden have no superiors. Hurter's life of Innocent III is the classic on that subject. Tosti's "Life of Boniface VIII" comes from the pen of one of the most learned Italians of this century. Yet they are all passed over in silence. Equally reprehensible is the omission of the work so frequently referred to by us—that of M. Gosselin. This treatise is admirable in every way: learned, fair and temperate. True, it is not very recent, but Mr. Dunning quotes other inferior works of a much greater antiquity.²

So much for the general bibliography. The same for the special ones at the end of each chapter, which indicate yet more clearly the character of the author's researches. For example let us take that at the end of Chapter IX, one of the most able and typical chapters in the whole book. It deals with "Theories during the Decline of the Papal Hegemony," discussing among others such characters as Boniface VIII and Philip the Fair. Now what are the authorities cited on the famous quarrel between these two? Pierre Dubois, an open foe of Boniface and

¹ Considering how lengthily our author quotes anti-papal contemporary writers like Dubois, Occam, Marsiglio of Padua, Gerson et al, the reader can consult the contemporary writers in favor of the popes in Alzog and Hergenröther's "General Histories." For instance list of those for and against Gregory VII, p. , Alzog II, p. 481, note; better still in Hergenröther III, p. 573-4 (French trans. of Abbé P. Belet, Paris, 1886), also in the "Histoire Générale" of Lavisse-Rambaud (II, pp. 115-116). It would also be well to read Gosselin (II, 199-239, 359 sqq.) on the opinions of medieval publicists and canonists who are judged somewhat inaccurately by Mr. Dunning.

² For opinions on Gosselin's book see his own references. Vol. I, p. xvii.

supporter of Philip; Pierre Dupuy, a sixteenth century Gallican, intense royalist, admirer of Philip whom he praises "pour la généreuse poursuite qu'il fit contre le pape Boniface"—the generosity consisting in public insult in open Parliament, physical outrage at Anagni and vile, remorseless calumny after death; Baillet, a seventeenth century Jansenist and none too friendly to Boniface; Adolph Franck, a Jew, who, though calm in style and able as a controversialist, is certainly not pro-papal in any sense of the term;¹ P. Janet, in general an elegant and cultured writer, but by no means sympathetic with Boniface;² Francois Laurent, to whose eyes the papacy is the "esprit de domination incarné" and "un vrai danger pour le Christianisme" (p. 514, op. cit.); Renan, who needs no comment; Blakey who asserts that:

"In proportion as the political power of the church became more concentrated and energetic, in the same ratio was the religious liberty of the subject curtailed and abridged. . . . Ignorance consequently became the only absolute safeguard against the intellectual intolerance of the clerical body; so that the minds of the people became enveloped in the most profound and impenetrable darkness," etc.³

Bryce's Holy Roman Empire about which our opinion is above expressed; Gierke, a typical "German" scholar, generally objective but certainly not in sympathy with anything papal; Gieseler, a learned and temperate Protestant. On Friedberg I do not risk an opinion, not having his work. So then the author refers the reader to every writer⁴ of consequence who is either distinctly hostile or at best indifferent to the papal side of this crucial quarrel between the medieval papacy and the civil power. But what of the writers favorable to it? Everyone is omitted. There is no mention of Hergenröther's masterly defence of Boniface in Essay IX of his "Catholic Church and Christian State," nor of Boniface's milder critics such as Boutaric (*La France sous Philippe le Bel*), though he is mentioned in the general bibliography. Also

¹ See for instance his estimate of Saurez in his "Réformateurs et Publicistes de l'Europe au dix-septième siècle."

² See p. 457 of Vol. I of work cited by Dunning where he speaks of the "flots bouillants de son orgueil et de son ambition," i. e., of Boniface.

³ P. 317, Vol. I, op. cit.

⁴ For other anti-papal writers, more or less bigoted, see Gosselin *passim*, particularly II, 138, 140, 4-5, 19, 137, 20.

omitt
("Sto
Cantù
d'Eco
(Essa
of Ch
(Paris
ecclési
of the
of Phi
from 1
röther
essays
Dublin

The
of or
subjec

In
such h
the les
ablest
in no v
A typ
Mr. T
Papsts
doubt
Dunnin
sixtee
Mr. Du
fessed
origina
to Hun
of Inn

¹ If
Catholic
by Mr.
Générale
most of
Voigt,
our auth
² See

omitted are the excellent works of the Benedictine Luigi Tosti, ("Storia di Bonifazio," VIII, Monte Cassino, 1846), of Cesare Cantù (Boniface VIII, Dante e Cecco d'Ascoli in *Revue d'Economie Chrétienne* for May, 1866), of Cardinal Wiseman (Essays, Vol. III), of J. Jolly (Philippe le Bel, Paris, 1869), of Christophe's "Histoire de la Papauté au XIV siècle" (Paris, 1853), of the Abbé Peltier's "Traité de la puissance ecclésiastique" (1857), of Gosselin's "Power of the Popes," of the above mentioned monographs by Bowyer and Molitor, of Philipps' works on German canon and feudal law published from 1832 to 1851, of the general church histories of Hergenröther and Alzog fully equal to Gieseler, or lastly of the able essays on these subjects in such Catholic periodicals as the *Dublin Review*.

The conclusion is evident. Either our author is ignorant of or deliberately ignores much of the best literature on his subject.¹

In either case it strikes us as high time to call a halt upon such high-handed proceedings. We decline politely but none the less firmly to be brushed aside as ignorant, to have our ablest advocates contemptuously ignored by writers who are in no way their superiors and in many respects their inferiors. A typical instance of this spirit can be found in p. 313 of Mr. Tout's work. He refers to Hurter's "Geschichte des Papsts Innocenz III" as "rather an old-fashioned book," doubtless because published in 1833. Yet both Tout and Dunning will not hesitate to cite anti-papal writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries like Du Puy and Baillet, Mr. Dunning even refers us to Hallam, a gentleman who confessed that he had "hardly any direct acquaintance with the original sources of medieval history,"² yet omits all reference to Hurter who gave up twenty years to the study of the age of Innocent III alone. This present work on "Political

¹ If one considers us biased in referring the reader to the bibliographies of Catholic writers like Alzog and Hergenröther as a corrective for those supplied by Mr. Dunning, let him turn to the learned and not Catholic "Histoire Générale" of Lavisse-Rambaud. In their bibliographies we find mentioned most of the works referred to by us. Thus (Vol. II, p. 118) we see noticed Voigt, Grfrörer, Delare; Hurter on p. 233; Tosti on p. 63—all of which writers our author disdains to notice.

² See *Dublin Review*, February, 1841; November 1841.

Theories" is the latest and most colossal instance of this crass ignorance and bland contempt of any writing that is favorable to the Papacy. Such a spirit is unfair; it is uncritical, and it is bound to keep open the wounds of controversy. Whatever it is, it is not historical.

Such being the company usually kept by our author it is to be expected that he should make out a bad case for the papacy in general. The popes of course "ruthlessly employed their power" (p. 144). Gregory I "greatly promoted the tendency of the faith to ignorance and superstition" (159). Then we hear the familiar ring that echoes back to Du Puy, Gibbon, Fleury of the "arrogance" (170) of Gregory VII, the "ingenuity" (173) of Innocent III. The popes prevent the national consolidation of Italy (289); seek to govern *all* the destinies of mankind without responsibility to any temporal power (146); their "motives" are always therefore "obvious" (223) *i. e.*, to Mr. Dunning; they are ever opposed to the sentiment of nationality, for instance in the case of Boniface (224), though Father Barry pays his respects to *that* charge with ungloved hands (p. 416 of his work). And so on with tiresome monotony the time-worn adjectives and nouns are dunned into our ears—the same old charges that one can read better put by Gibbon, Janet, Laurent, Du Puy, Baillet, Bryce, etc. It is wearisome reading, verily. Although we do Mr. Dunning the justice to say that his work as a whole is not marred by *apparent* bitterness. His style is always temperate and gentlemanly even when partisan.

To write a full criticism of his book would necessitate a running commentary, as faults of judgment abound on every page, and not a few of fact also exist. Take an instance. He says (p. 216): "There is some question as to the authenticity of the words attributed to Boniface VIII: 'We wish you (Philip) to understand that you are subject to us in spirituals and in temporals.'" Some doubt? "The forgery of this document" (containing these words) "is now, as Hefele says, universally acknowledged except by Huber." (Hergenröther's "Church and State," Essay XI, § II.) But space will not allow us to go further. If the reader wishes us to

test the
Mr. D.
and re
eleven
titled
crucia
Philip
than a
between
parties
standp
piece o
one-sid
of wor
anti-pa
It is a
can sa
for the
by the
Nogard
of the
brough
outrag
Sciarr
him th
him ha
through
was or
from a
no less
also to
on the
Trium
röther¹
not qu
fact all
possibl

test the case for himself let him take the opening pages of Mr. Dunning's ninth chapter, which deals with Boniface VIII and read, as it were in parallel columns, the above mentioned eleventh Essay of Hergenröther's "Church and State" entitled "Boniface VIII and Philip the Fair." This is a crucial test. Boniface represents the extreme of papal claims, Philip the extreme of royal. Passion on both sides runs higher than at any other time. The whole questions of the relations between Church and State are exhaustively treated by both parties. It is then the best test case possible from an objective standpoint. Moreover it is among the best, if not the very best, piece of work in all of Mr. Dunning's book. And yet how one-sided is his whole treatment? By skilful manipulation of words he attains the same ends as the most malignant of anti-papal historians without using the savage expressions. It is a case of *suppressio veri*, of ambiguous expressions which can save the writer if he be attacked. Not a word of blame for the unspeakable outrages to which Boniface was subjected by the infamous Philip the "Unfair" and his agents Marigny, Nogaret, Paterine, Pierre Flotte, Plasian and Sciarra Colonna; of the shameless and absurd charges of heresy, sorcery, sodomy brought against the Pope in open Parliament; of that final outrage at Anagni on September 7, 1303, when Nogaret and Sciarra Colonna dragged Boniface from his palace, paraded him through the streets in derision, stole his treasures and left him half-famished. All this is sedulously avoided. Philip throughout the chapter appears as an enlightened prince who was only seeking to safeguard the national honor of France from a foolish old pope, whereas in reality he was a tyrant no less to his people than to the Church. Our author takes care also to present always the views of the most extreme advocates on the Papal side, such as Aegidius Romanus and Augustinus Triumphus, although if the reader will consult Hergenröther¹ at note 2, p. 203, he will find that Aegidius Romanus is not quite as extreme as Dunning would have us believe. In fact all through his work the author seems to avoid as far as possible any exposition of the more moderate position known

¹ Op. cit.

as the "indirect power" of the pope over temporalities held by the majority of theologians, both modern and medieval.¹ By such a method one could very easily turn the tables and quote from only the most extreme advocates of the royal party. Again his expressions are ambiguous. On p. 218 he says that Augustinus Triumphus ascribed to the Pope *divine* attributes because Augustinus claimed for the Pope jurisdiction greater than that of an angel. Well! now! after all is not the Papal jurisdiction of *divine* origin according to Catholic belief? Was not the Bible of *divine* origin very largely? And with a modicum of common sense and fairness can we not easily recognize that this is all that Augustinus means by the *divinity* in the papal jurisdiction? And so it goes all along every line of the chapter which is radically and persistently disingenuous, as the reader will easily perceive by a parallel reading of Hergenröther.

To sum up. The present work, though brilliant in its way, cannot be accepted as anything better than an able exposé of one side of the complex question of medieval papal politics. It deliberately ignores or is ignorant of all the literature on the papal side and throughout skillfully presents the papal arguments in their worst light. As a gentlemanly onslaught against the medieval papacy it will find a hearty welcome among those readers to whom history is a lawyer's plea, all the more so as it carries along with it a pretentious apparatus of ex parte literature and is written with an easy contemptuous elegance which Gibbon himself might envy.

A few closing remarks as to the future of historical writing on this subject. That a better spirit is upon us no one can doubt. It is surely a sign of the times when a publishing house like the Macmillans feels itself safe in entrusting to a Catholic priest the writing of one of its volumes of the Nations Series. And it is equally a sign of the times when Father Barry writes of the Papacy with such fearlessness. Yet the above researches are enough to show that much of the old leaven remains, enough to justify a warning.

Now the non-Catholic will forever be incapable of penning a fair history of the Medieval Empire so long as he refuses to

¹ Ib., 217-218.

recognize that the papacy was a tremendous moral force sustained by the faith of the people. Whether that faith was wrong or right is another question. As Mr. Tout very generously admits: "It was as the protectors of the people, not as the enemies of their political rights that the great Popes of the eleventh and twelfth centuries had obtained their wonderful ascendancy over the best minds of Europe" (327). Moreover it is undeniable that the Medieval Papacy was the soul and prime-mover certainly in every moral reform of any consequence and in almost every intellectual movement. It raised the priesthood out of the mire of feudalism, unaided by the Episcopate. It brought into life and sustained the Crusades. It was the only court of appeal capable of shielding a nation from the tyranny of a John or Philip Augustus. In a word it was the brains, the heart, the very soul of medieval civilization. Unless then this is granted the non-Catholic historian must necessarily lose his perspective and seek for other causes totally inadequate to explain the rise of the political power of the Papacy. To attempt to explain it by the aggressiveness of Hildebrand or the ingenuity of Innocent is begging the question. For how could such popes have succeeded in their aggression and ingenuity unless the spirit of the times was sympathetic and made such success a possibility. They had no armies of their own. They appealed always to law, Scripture, civil custom, conscience. And for centuries the world heeded that appeal. Is this not clear proof that their power fundamentally rested upon the faith and love of the masses? Mr. Hurter, even when a Protestant, felt the logic of this reflection.

"L'existence d'un pape du moyen age est un fragment de l'histoire universelle, et celle-ci, sans la clef de l'église, perd cette base centrale, la sourcee de cette vie qui circule dans toutes les parties du corps européen. . . . Il (Innocent III) avait le sentiment de la plus haute destination du Pontificat, la volonté de la réaliser, il la regardait comme une institution établie par Dieu lui-même pour la direction de l'Eglise et le salut du genre humain. Que la croyance qui le faisait agir, considérée en elle-même, soit vraie au fausse . . . c'est une question . . . qui appartient à la polémique théologique, mais dont l'histoire n'a point à s'occuper. *Il suffit seulement à l'histoire de savoir que*

cette croyance dominait à une certaine époque, et qu'elle se liait à une institution qui exerçait une souveraine et universelle influence . . . Parmi tous les hommes . . . nuls n'ont plus souvent éprouvé que les papes . . . le malheur d'être mal jugés, parce qu'ils l'ont été sans considérer, comme on le devait, le temps où ils ont vécu et les devoirs de leur charge.”¹

Here is the whole difficulty in a nutshell. It is impossible to narrow the struggles of the Papacy with temporal sovereigns down to a squabble over temporalities, however much their quarrels took this form. It was a tremendous conflict of principles lying at the very foundation of society, and therefore nothing but a prevailing consciousness on the part of society that the popes represented right can explain the long supremacy of the Medieval Papacy in the face of the persistent and bitter protests of that same society against the wrong in it. The very failure of the Hohenstaufen legists, the Ghibelline poet Dante, of the lampoons and satires of Jacopone da Todi, the bolder speculations of Marsiglio of Padua, Wycliffe and Pierre Dubois—so many attempts to bring on the Reformation before its actual appearance—is undeniable proof that society revered and sustained the Papacy to the very last extreme of patience. Is it not all in the medieval mystic cry for a Papa Apostolico? Mr. Dunning, like most of his Protestant predecessors in this department of history, has completely missed this great and guiding fact. With all his apparent fairness and learning his work marks an advance in the study of history only so far as it necessarily moves along with the mere inertia of present-day historical investigation.

The second warning. Non-Catholic writers will continue to misunderstand the Papacy so long as they persist in accepting only one Catholic theory of Church and State as the theory of all Catholics. Now there have been and are now held by Catholics theories which allow the very widest freedom of opinion. Briefly, they are three: the direct, the indirect, the

¹ Hurter, III, pp. xxxv–xxxvii. In passing one cannot help recording with some amusement the contradiction of various writers when criticizing the Papacy. For instance Mr. Tout (p. 143) grows quite impatient with Paschal II: “the blundering Pope had betrayed the temporal possessions of the clergy and the necessary bulwarks of the freedom of the spiritual power.” Yet other writers like Mr. Dunning blame them chiefly for defending their temporal possessions. Verily the Popes are between the devil and the deep sea of historical criticism!

direct
thorin
of th
posed
upon
the C
ience
a me
the C
in ea
only
patie
de fa
Chun
the E
of Pi
The
Midd
umpl
The
Féne
most
most
has h
direc
Ages
full
fact i
and w
than
But i
consi
from
most
cans

¹ F
State,”
indirec
more t
thought

directive. The direct gives the Pope direct, immediate authority over temporals, so that civil rulers are but the servants of the Church, receive their power from her and can be deposed for misconduct by her. The indirect gives the Church power over temporals only in so far as temporals intrench upon religion and thus in a way become spiritual concerns; the Church cannot depose a civil ruler but only declare obedience to him not binding whosoever that obedience becomes a menace to the Church, to spirituals. The directive allows the Church no constraining power whatsoever over temporals: in case of a conflict between her and civil authority she can only advise, confer, plead, and if these fail, then suffer patiently. Surely here is a great latitude for opinions, and, *de facto*, Catholic theologians have variously held them, the Church, not even in such apparently positive documents as the Bull "Unam Sanctam" of Boniface VIII and the Syllabus of Pius IX, having never officially taken sides on the question. The direct theory was maintained by a few men in the later Middle Ages, such as Henry of Segusia, Augustinus Triumphus, perhaps John of Salisbury and Thomas à Becket. The directive originated first with Gerson and afterwards with Fénelon. The indirect though even in the Middle Ages the most generally accepted theory, was formulated and developed most clearly by Cardinal Bellarmine. Of these three which has had the most vogue among Catholics? Certainly not the direct. It was maintained by only a few even in the Middle Ages and then only after the papal power had reached its full vigor. The indirect has most adherents in Europe, in fact is quite the vogue among Catholic theologians generally, and we do not see how any thinking man can regard it other than perfectly reasonable from a theoretical point of view. But in America where the diversity of religions has made us consider all questions affecting Church and State necessarily from a practical point of view, it is not unsafe to say that most Americans adopt the directive theory, Protestant Americans not less than Catholic.¹

¹ For a full exposition of these theories consult Hergenröther's "Church and State," II, Essay XIII, and Gosselin, II, pp. 359 et sq. Hergenröther favors the indirect theory, Gosselin is a disciple of Fénelon. Of the two Gosselin seems the more temperate in style and historical in treatment. Hergenröther is a pleader, though a masterly one. Gosselin *in re* is more of an historian.

Now, this being the case, is it not manifestly unfair for the average non-Catholic historian, like Mr. Dunning for instance, to pick out the weakest and least prevalent theory (the direct) to either say or imply that it is the official theory of the Church and then hold it up to scorn? To leave the wrong impression that the present-day church still maintains officially the right of deposing civil rulers and otherwise interfering in matters purely temporal, a right which she wisely forbears to attempt exercising now but which she hopes to exercise in the future? It is not said in so many words, but such is the impression created by his book and that of pretty much all others from the pens of English Protestants. As the reader sees it is a false one. From also this point of view then the work of Mr. Dunning is fundamentally defective, a defect due to his apparently complete ignorance of Catholic literature on his subject.

The above is written with a keen appreciation of the candor displayed by many non-Catholics when treating of the Medieval Papacy.¹ It is written with a still keener regret that we English-speaking Catholics should have produced so little that is worth reading, at least on this subject, and that many of us seem to fear telling the truth about the undeniable failures and faults of many popes. The Papacy itself, be it said to its credit, has deliberately condemned such timorousness and indifference. Leo XIII, in his brief of congratulation to Dr. Pastor, expressed an ardent wish that Catholics should write "diligenter ac sincere" de "rebus gestis Pontificum Maximorum." Still more recently he has told Father Mann that "you must make the Popes known" (*Bisogna far conoscere i Papi*). Let us then, to quote a hackneyed phrase, be up and doing, because we are surely doing very little, and let us do it sincerely and thoroughly. So long as we leave the field to non-Catholic critics we have none but ourselves to blame if they write of the Medieval Papacy with little sympathy, often with bigotry.

LUCIAN JOHNSTON.

¹ A casual reading of both Hergenröther and Gosselin will show a mass of testimonies from non-Catholic writers in favor of the Popes. Of the services rendered by the Papacy to Medieval Europe as an international tribunal see the remarkable article in the review "La Papauté et les Peuples" for September-October, 1902 (Paris). In the same article are quoted a number of writers on medieval papal politics by the side of whom it were well to place works like Mr. Dunning's and others simply by way of showing that works of their class are very rare in English.

SKEPTICISM AS A BASIS OF RELIGION.

In our review of Mr. Mallock's recent attack on the methods and arguments of our Catholic apologists for theism, we saw that, although he pronounces their reasoning to be worthless and even disgraceful, nevertheless, a cursory perusal of their works shows that in every case he has utterly failed to understand the position he attacks. Destructive criticism was not, however, the ultimate purpose of Mr. Mallock's excursion into the field of theistic Apologetics. His ulterior aim was to discover a reasonable basis for religious belief, and—the present bootless and ineffectual methods having been abandoned—to point out an intellectual road by which those thoughtful minds, whose faith had been shaken by the advance of scientific thought, may reach again a position of religious certainty.

In the present paper we shall consider Mr. Mallock's constructive attempt and note what measure of success he has achieved. In order to do this we must recall the fact that his constructive effort derives its whole significance from the conflict and contradiction which he alleges to exist between science and religion. It is only in the light of his unwarranted concessions to philosophic monism, that Mr. Mallock's theistic apology becomes intelligible. The substance of these concessions to the enemies of religion, as well as the whole trend of his destructive criticism, is conveniently and concisely epitomized in the following characteristic passage regarding the attitude of science towards the doctrine of human freedom; "Physiology," he tells us, "by its exposition of the facts and its establishment of the principle of heredity . . . has stopped the last earth in which the phantom of freedom could hide itself. It has supplied the last link in the chain by which man is bound to the mechanism of universal nature—has shown him to be part and parcel of one single and inexorable process, and no more responsible for any one of his thoughts or actions than he is for those of his grandfather, for the colour of his

eyes, or for the history and temperature of the earth which have rendered his life possible" (pp. 147-8).

In the light of this assertion one would naturally expect to find Mr. Mallock joining forces with Professor Haeckel in definitely consigning the doctrine of human freedom to the limbo of obsolete formulas. But nothing could be farther from his intentions. Having commemorated the "invulnerable" and "unimpeachable" arguments of monistic philosophers, he flatly denies their conclusions, and proceeds in the very teeth of positive science to "exhibit the doctrine of moral freedom as worthy of a reasonable man's acceptance."

In dealing with Mr. Mallock's defense of theism we must distinguish between a preliminary discussion, and the foundation of belief itself. The former consists of an abortive attempt to show that "contradictories—such as freedom and not-freedom—may be compatible." This contention, although entirely prefatory, is nevertheless absolutely essential to the favorable issue of Mr. Mallock's argument. For, unless freedom and not-freedom can be shown to be compatible in the same person, it would be the limit of absurdity to ask a reasonable man to give simultaneous assent to such mutually contradictory doctrines. This proposition, however, supposing it to be satisfactorily established, brings us only to the threshold of the theistic position; it shows that a belief in the doctrines of religion is not obviously irrational, that the conclusions of science should form no antecedent prejudice against the truth of theism; but it provides no positive ground for assent to religion. It is to the discovery and elaboration of this positive basis of religious belief that Mr. Mallock devotes the second portion of his argument. Here he reveals to our astonished gaze a moral order, a world of subjective values, altogether independent of the cosmic order, the world of scientific facts. And he points out that just as all our knowledge about the cosmic order is built on the judgment that the external world exists, so in like manner, our knowledge of the moral and religious order is based on the "judgment" that human progress, *i. e.*, the development of man's highest faculties, has a supreme significance. This instinctive "judgment" consti-

tutes the *practical basis* and reasonable warrant for an assent to each of the essential principles of theism, viz., moral freedom, human *immortality*, and an ethical God.

But since this basic "judgment" is an "instinctive and not a cognitive act," the question will arise, What grounds have we for imputing to it any objective validity? Mr. Mallock answers that we apprehend and accept this proposition regarding human progress by an act of instinctive faith essentially similar to the act by which we apprehend and accept the existence of the external universe. And of these mutually independent worlds—the cosmic world and the moral—the latter has always been, for the highest and strongest races, and must always continue to be, no less of a reality than the former. In the recognition of this fact, according to Mr. Mallock, lies the reasonable liberation of religious belief from the stifling limitations imposed on it by the recent progress and present conditions of scientific thought. Mr. Mallock's confidence that he has achieved success where, according to his own expression, the attempts made by the profoundest minds in all ages have been "ridiculous and ignominious failures," invites a separate consideration of the two steps which his argument comprises. The first in order is the *practical synthesis of contradictions*.

I.

Mr. Mallock makes no attempt to conceal the serious difficulties of the problem which, at the very outset, confronts him. On the one hand he accepts without demur the scientific disproof of moral freedom; he proposes to vindicate the reality of moral freedom, on the other. His first task, therefore, is to show that two contradictory propositions may both be true. This thesis Mr. Mallock does not profess to establish by a direct demonstration; what he proposes to do is to adduce numerous examples of "contradictions" involved in the most elementary religious and "scientific" beliefs, hoping thereby to convince the reader that, owing to the constitution of our own minds and of the universe, no coherent thought would be possible unless we were continually to give simultaneous assent to contradictions, not consciously, perhaps, but at least

by implication. If then, both the religious synthesis and the "scientific" are at bottom self-contradictory, and if, nevertheless, we may, as perfectly reasonable beings, persist in our belief in the reality either of the cosmic world or of the moral, there can be no antecedent reason why we should not assent to both at the same time: in a word, "no greater contradiction in thought is involved in a deliberate belief in the coexistence of the two incompatible worlds than is involved in a belief in the existence of either of these worlds separately" (p. 286).

It will make for clearness if we here state briefly a fact which will become more evident as we proceed, viz., that the formal fallacy in Mr. Mallock's attempt to prove his thesis by an appeal to alleged "contradictions" involved in the religious synthesis, lies in the double sense in which he uses the term "contradiction." He uses the term, first, in its proper sense, in which a proposition is said to contain a contradiction if it at once affirms and denies the same thing. In this sense, Mr. Mallock's thesis involves a contradiction. He uses the term, secondly, in an entirely improper sense, *i. e.*, he calls a proposition self-contradictory if only the human mind is incapable of harmonizing the subject and predicate in thought.

Such a proposition may properly be termed incomprehensible or inconceivable; but as John Stuart Mill pointed out, we should not be warranted in calling such a proposition "self-contradictory" unless "we knew *a priori* that we must have been created capable of conceiving whatever is capable of existing . . . an assumption more destitute of evidence could scarcely be made."¹ The supposed "contradiction" inherent in our religious concepts will be found to be, even on Mr. Mallock's own admission, not self-contradictory at all, but merely inconceivable.

Putting aside for the moment all consideration of the formal validity of his argument, let us observe a material implication of which, strangely enough, Mr. Mallock does not seem to have been aware. The assertion that a man may be morally-free and not-morally-free, at the same time, is clearly an explicit denial of the principles of contradiction, *viz.*, that

¹ "Examination of Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy," Vol. I, p. 85.

a thing cannot be and not-be at the same time. Now, one of the peculiar characteristics of the principle of contradiction is that it cannot be denied explicitly, without being at the same time affirmed implicitly; for the very denial loses all sense and meaning if it does not exclude the possibility that the principle is true. Furthermore, a disproof of the principle cannot be undertaken without, at each successive step, surreptitiously introducing the principle itself and assuming its truth. Thus, Mr. Mallock must of necessity implicitly repudiate in every sentence he writes, the very conclusion he professedly aims at establishing, and finally, when he has stated his conclusion in words, he has only succeeded in impaling himself on one or the other horn of this dilemma: either his conclusion is false, in which case his entire position collapses; or it is not false, and in that case—there being no repugnance between false and not-false—every word he utters, every sentence he frames, is reduced to the level of unmeaning gibberish. The naïveté with which Mr. Mallock sets about disproving the principle of contradiction is admirable. He is confident that if he only succeeds in disproving this principle, he will have pointed out a means whereby a man may reasonably assent both to the doctrines of religion and to the doctrines of “science” without any further unpleasant implications. He might as well propose to get rid of the principle of gravitation, and imagine that the only practical consequence of so doing would be that he could carry twice as heavy a burden as he was previously able to bear.

Mr. Mallock considers his position to be “sufficiently and conclusively illustrated by the admitted coexistence of sin and evil with a God who is all-good and all-powerful.” This example is not merely typical of the “contradictions” involved in our religious beliefs; it is, moreover, such a clear and undeniable illustration of his point that it stands in need of no further corroboration. So, at least, thinks Mr. Mallock. He has obviously failed to see that it devolves on him to show how the existence of sin logically involves a denial either of the goodness or of the omnipotence of God. Until this be established we cannot be justly accused of giving assent—even by

the remotest implication—to beliefs really contradictory. Such a demonstration, it is clear, cannot reasonably even be undertaken by any creature whose limited powers forbid his “grasping the scheme of things entire.” For “Who among men is he who can know the counsel of God? or who can say to him: Thou hast wrought iniquity”?

Not only can Mr. Mallock not show that this or any other essential doctrine of theism involves a denial of the principle of contradiction, but it never once crossed his mind to put forward so extravagant a claim. He admits freely that by “contradictions” he is here referring to propositions humanly inconceivable. Indeed, he sums up his remarks on this question by telling us that “that conception of God implies a co-existence of qualities in the same nature which cannot be reconciled by any other means than by a frank admission that this nature is *incomprehensible*” (p. 224). And he states explicitly that when he says contradictions need not be incompatible, he means “neither more nor less than . . . that the human intellect is an organ of *capacities so limited* that it is constitutionally unable to grasp life or existence in its totality” (p. 281). The source of Mr. Mallock’s error lies, therefore, not in attributing to an inconceivability the character of a real contradiction, but in paring down the content of the term “contradiction” until he destroys its nature. In a word, he fails to perceive that self-contradiction is a valid test of falsity, since it is an appeal to a positive power of the mind: while inconceivability, on the other hand, is not a criterion of falsity as it arises from a deficiency, an incapacity of the mind. If there remain any doubt that Mr. Mallock, instead of trying to prove that contradictions are compatible, has really been engaged in showing that inconceivability is not a test of falsity, it should be dispelled by reading the following passages from the last pages of his book. We have been “led astray” he tells, “by the idea that if two cognate beliefs are true, the human intellect must be able to attest their truth by reconciling them. . . . Let us only get rid of this utterly false idea that no two beliefs can be true which the intellect is unable to reconcile” (pp. 286-7), and we shall then with equal confidence be able to accept both monism and theism.

That inconceivability is no ultimate test of falsity has been a commonplace in Catholic philosophy for centuries. But, because the inconceivable may be true, it by no means follows that the self-contradictory may be true likewise. Yet, this is precisely Mr. Mallock's argument.

Before leaving this preliminary stage of the new *Apology*, we must advert briefly to Mr. Mallock's pseudo-“scientific” antinomies. As might have been anticipated, Mr. Mallock has here, again, erroneously identified Haeckel's monism with science. He points to the contradiction involved in the doctrine of a continuous ether, infinite in extent, out of which the existing universe arose by a process of condensation. This is not an established fact of science at all; it is not even a scientific hypothesis. Ether as a medium for the transmission of light, radiant heat, electricity, attraction and repulsion, is a proper enough subject for scientific theorizing. As long, however, as its very existence is hypothetical, there is nothing to prevent scientific philosophers like Haeckel from using it as a sort of school-boy's “Asia Minor” to which anything can be safely referred, if only its exact location is unknown. But is it not absurd to say that science has established “the three following facts: firstly, that the ether is the ultimate cause of all things; secondly, that it is homogeneous and non-atomic; thirdly, that it is capable of indefinite contraction and expansion” (p. 228)? Indeed, one need only glance through Mr. Mallock's pages (pp. 224–36) to be convinced that he is speaking of “contradictions” found, not in science, but in evolutionary monism. And in so far as he has pointed out real contradictions, he has simply dealt another blow to that already shattered mosaïc of contradictions, which Professor Haeckel boastingly calls his “consistent and monistic theory of the eternal cosmogenetic process.”

The same must be said of Mr. Mallock's analysis of the concepts of time and space. For, while the notion of “eternal time” and “infinite space,” which he shows to be self-contradictory, are fundamental postulates with the monist, it is an affront to common sense to report reasonable beings as really believing that “time is divided by an ever-moving point,

the present, into two eternities—the past eternity and the future" (p. 236), or that actual space is infinite, and supposing it to be bisected by a plane, "each of the halves, being on one side infinite still, will, in respect of its spatial content, be no less infinite than the two taken together" (p. 237). That these propositions regarding time and space are really self-contradictory in the proper sense of the word, proves not that contradictions are compatible, but that time is not eternal and space is not infinite. To deny that it proves this is to deny the possibility of all proof—it is to *evict* reason.

There is no need of insisting further on the ineptitude of Mr. Mallock's attempt to show that we may, as reasonable beings, assent to the principles of monism, and at the same time assent to the principles of theism. At the beginning of the chapter in which he undertakes to perform this feat, Mr. Mallock remarks that, "To accept contradictory propositions as not in reality incompatible, is, (the reader) will say, a procedure which can seem reasonable to a madman only" (p. 219). At the end of the chapter the careful reader will be compelled in all honesty to admit that he has been strongly confirmed in his original opinion.

Consequently—since contradictions still remain incompatible—if science, as Mr. Mallock thinks, "forms an absolute affirmation of monism," an inquiry into the second stage of his argument would clearly be a waste of time. We have seen, however, in our review of Mr. Mallock's destructive criticism, that "science in the sense of 'rigorously verified fact' repudiates evolutionary monism at every step." Hence, we are not compelled *a priori* to regard the belief in God as a superstition, nor the belief in moral freedom as a subjective delusion. Our next concern, therefore, shall be with Mr. Mallock's attempt to discover a reasonable foundation, independent of science, for our religious convictions.

II.

The *practical basis* and justification of religious belief, according to Mr. Mallock, is to be found in certain instinctive "judgments" or appreciations of human worth, which, he maintains, "wholly escape the scrutiny of science." These

"jud
belie
or as
ress,
with
embr
Mr.
no si
destin
he is
religi
"jud

B
of th
quest
Mallo
freed
actua
hum
in th
trines
up w
exam
depen
self-c
scienc
porta
tive a
ively
one's
the li
briefly

1.
Mallo
in th
to est
as an
of th

"judgments" are capable of various expression: *e. g.*, as a belief in the dignity and sanctity of the individual human life: or as an instinctive assent to the proposition that human progress, *i. e.*, the development of man's highest faculties, is invested with a supreme significance. This latter statement obviously embraces all other formulations of the basic judgment, for as Mr. Mallock himself points out, "human progress will have no significance at all, unless the individual has some personal destiny beyond that of being sacrificed to a purpose in which he is not himself included" (p. 252). The *practical basis* of religious belief is therefore found to lie in an instinctive "judgment" of mankind that *human progress has a meaning*.

Before the skeptical mind will acquiesce in the sufficiency of this foundation of belief, it will propound several anxious questions which press for a definite answer: First: Has Mr. Mallock succeeded in showing that the doctrine of human freedom, which lies at the heart of the theistic position, is actually involved in the moral and social development of the human race? Second: As a matter of fact, is not our belief in the meaning of human progress derived from the very doctrines of theism, which Mr. Mallock is attempting to bolster up with it, *i. e.*, is not Mr. Mallock's whole Apology a glaring example of *petitio principii*? Third: Is this belief really independent of science—and, if not, does not Mr. Mallock stand self-convicted of failure by the fact that he is trying to "meet science on its own ground"? Fourth, and perhaps most important: If this basic judgment be an instinctive, not a cognitive act, what grounds have we for supposing it to be objectively valid? On the answer given to these question must rest one's estimate of the value of Mr. Mallock's contribution to the literature of theistic Apology. We shall consider them briefly, beginning with the first.

1. In establishing the doctrine of human freedom, Mr. Mallock does not pretend to show that it is *logically* involved in the very concept of human progress. What he proposes to establish is that the belief in freedom is *practically* required as an essential condition for the moral and social development of the human race. This belief—so he argues—engenders

conscience and a sense of moral responsibility: and without these, progress is simply impossible. For, "there is no more effective instrument of self-restraint in existence than the knowledge on a man's part that, if he acts in a certain way, he will have to submit to his own condemnation of himself" (p. 246). If, on the contrary, man once becomes convinced that not he, but nature whose creature he is, is responsible for his acts—"self-condemnation will be impossible, his whole dread of it will be gone, and one entire side of his moral self will be paralyzed." But this is not all. "Besides losing our power of condemning ourselves or others," continues Mr. Mallock, "we shall lose our power of esteeming ourselves or others, likewise. All the higher developments of friendship, love, and admiration would sink into the same grave that has engulfed condemnation and hatred" (p. 247). In a word, eliminate our belief in moral freedom, and you strike from human consciousness the source from which spring all the higher, the deeper, the more delicate, the more interesting elements in life. If we were deprived of the belief that we are free, we should lose our chief reason for acting and thinking after that peculiar fashion which constitutes human progress: we should lose the motive which *determines* our will to choose what is good and elevating, in preference to what is bad and debasing.

In fact, for human development, according to Mr. Mallock, the belief in freedom must be present, as a motive for action; but the possession of real freedom is by no means essential; it would, on the contrary, be highly undesirable. For, since a free being is "more than the agent of motives" there is nothing to keep him from imperilling human progress by "acting like a drunken man" without motive. Hence man must be beguiled into acting for his highest interests by a pleasant fiction, which, *to be effective must be delusive*. "Ut pueris olim dant frustula blandi doctores." Expunge our belief in freedom whilst leaving us the reality, and you eliminate all the more valuable elements in life: civilization would decay, the sky of human progress would be forever overcast. But if, on the other hand, we were deprived of real freedom whilst

fondly believing ourselves possessed of it, human intercourse would lose none of its zest and significance. Such are the implications of Mr. Mallock's argument. It should be clear that this line of reasoning would at best prove that the *belief* in moral freedom is a practical prerequisite of human progress: but as regards the correspondence of this belief with objective reality—which is the only question at issue—it does not enable us to form the remotest conjecture.

It is important to observe that the objective validity of this belief is not enhanced by the fact that human progress is inseparable from meaning. For whether human progress have any significance or not, it is only the belief in freedom that is involved as a practical prerequisite. The only advantage Mr. Mallock's supposition possesses over its rival is that, if human progress really has a meaning, it is not *obviously irrational* to suppose that man is free, as it would be on the contrary assumption.

The question-begging character of Mr. Mallock's defense of freedom may be plainly discerned in the following compendious statement: "If we do but succeed in showing that this one doctrine of freedom is really essential to life as men are resolved to live it, we shall have established in theory everything for which we are now contending" (p. 248). In other words our belief in freedom is valid because it is essential to life as men are resolved to live it. But why are men resolved to live in this particular way? Because, forsooth, they believe in human freedom and responsibility—as Mr. Mallock has been at such pains to show. And why do they believe in human freedom? Because they are resolved to live a certain fashion, and the belief in freedom is practically essential to that life. Thus we are led round and round in a circle incurably vicious.

One is by no means prepared to admit that Mr. Mallock has proven even the belief in moral responsibility to be a necessary condition of human development, moral, intellectual, or social. So eminent an authority as Dr. Martineau is of opinion¹ that an impartial observer would probably find more

¹"A Study of Religion," Vol. II, p. 186.

striking examples of moral greatness in the ranks of the Determinists than in those of the Libertarians. Without assenting to this somewhat extreme view we may recall the fact that, in the ancient world, the name of "Stoic" was synonymous with high-mindedness and prudence and moral integrity. Yet the Stoics were Determinists. In more recent times the self-restraint and austerity of the Puritan type of character has become proverbial; but the Puritans, it is well known, did not believe in human responsibility. And the people of the far East, are they not fatalists? Still it cannot be denied that great rulers and empires, and even great systems of thought, have arisen among them.

Enough has been said to make it evident that Mr. Mallock's practical basis of belief furnishes no warrant for the objective validity of the belief in human freedom. His view of the entire theistic problem is identical with that of Voltaire; "although there be no God, we should have to create Him—although physiology has established as a fact of positive knowledge that man is no more responsible for his acts than he is for the acts of his grandfather, still we should embrace the delusive belief that we are free in order to make life bearable." Hence, it is to be feared that Mr. Mallock's solution for the theistic problem will prove unsatisfactory even to that limited and anomalous class of readers for whose express benefit it was excogitated, *i. e.*, for "those who are doubtful of the religious view or deny it; but who in doubting or denying it, do so *against their will* and are looking about them in vain for some intellectual road by which they may reach again a position of religious certainty" (p. 3).

2. We have seen that Mr. Mallock has failed to derive the reality of human freedom from the judgment that "human progress is invested with deep significance." (This basic judgment is for the moment accepted as objectively valid.) We must not, however, be understood to imply that no logical connection exists between the two doctrines; but that the connection which exists between them is the reverse of what Mr. Mallock imagines it to be. The fact is that the doctrine of moral freedom is a logical antecedent of the doctrine that

human
Mallock
that th
without
any va
And t
the su
warran
with m
agents
But
prior t
an imn
presup
belief
which
of free
may be
dom; a
intellec
mortala
edge th
over, u
necessa
this ev
that se
suppor
extrin
ultimat
suppos
ing of
intellec
our as
either
tion to
Malloc
life is
possibl

human progress has a meaning. This is admitted by Mr. Mallock himself in at least one passage, in which he tells us that the doctrine of human freedom is a "latent supposition" without which it would be impossible for us to believe that any value inheres in what human beings do or are (p. 248). And this must be admitted by everyone who reflects on the subject, that—supernatural revelation apart—our main warrant for the belief that human development is instinct with meaning, lies in a previous conviction that we are free agents morally responsible for our actions.

But, although the doctrine of moral freedom is logically prior to the belief in the worth of human progress, it is not an immediate premise to that belief. It is not even a necessary presupposition, and for a very simple reason, viz., that the belief in the immortality and spiritual dignity of man, which constitutes the intermediate step between the doctrine of freedom and the doctrine that progress has a meaning, may be established on grounds other than that of moral freedom; *e. g.*, it may be arrived at from a consideration of the intellectual activities of man. Our knowledge of human immortality is the immediate logical antecedent of our knowledge that human progress is invested with meaning. Moreover, unlike the doctrine of moral freedom, it is an absolutely necessary antecedent. A moment's consideration will make this evident. A reasonable assent to a proposition requires that some evidence—intrinsic or extrinsic—be presented in support of the proposition. In the present case, the only extrinsic evidence which could command our assent, must ultimately be divine revelation. But divine revelation presupposes the existence of God. Hence, the belief in the meaning of human progress, if it is to constitute a *basis*, "a firm intellectual basis of religious belief" (p. 284), must compel our assent on grounds of intrinsic evidence, *i. e.*, it must be either self-evident or logically inferred from some proposition to which we have previously assented. Now, surely Mr. Mallock will not maintain that the supreme worth of human life is self-evident. On such a supposition it would be impossible to explain the stubborn conviction of millions of

Buddhists that the essence of all existence, especially of sentient and rational existence, is evil. Nor does the "splendid purpose" of human development seem self-evident to those other millions who have been ground down in the competitive struggle for the bare necessities which sustain life. On the contrary, were they not supported by a belief in God and human immortality they would be forced to echo the sentiment expressed by Sophocles: "Not to have been born at all is the happiest fate, and the next best is to die young." The truth is that the principles of theism alone are our reasonable warrant for reprobating the pessimism inherent in the doctrines of Haeckel's pseudo-scientific monism—according to which the individual human life is a colorless fragment of a soulless universe. No one would seem to recognize this fact more clearly than did Mr. Mallock when he wrote: "Progress or evolution will have no significance at all unless the individual has some personal destiny beyond that of being sacrificed to a purpose in which he is not included" (p. 252). This is clearly an avowal that the doctrine of human immortality must be admitted before we can have any knowledge of the value or meaning of development. It is self-evident that, when this relation exists between two doctrines, the former is not derived from the latter, but vice versa. Hence, Mr. Mallock's whole attempt to base the principles of theism on the belief in the meaning of human progress is a flagrant *petitio principii*.

It may be objected that Mr. Mallock has obviated the force of this criticism by expressly stating that this basic judgment or belief is not an act of reason at all, but an act of pure will, or instinct. Therefore, it might be argued, this act has nothing whatever to do with the appreciation of evidence, and consequently is not amenable to the rules of reason. To quote the words of Mr. Mallock himself: "Life presents to us two great orders of things. One of them is the cosmos, or the world of objective facts. The other is the moral world, or the world of subjective values. . . . The cosmic world we interpret by the exact methods of science, and the results are such that an acceptance of them is *forced by the evidence* on our judgment,

the judgment itself being passive. . . . The moral world we interpret by standards which we supply ourselves, and our judgment is not passive but active. . . . It is easy to see that here, where the *standard of truth is a variable*, no science strictly so-called can exist" (p. 272).

Mr. Mallock's contention comes to this; judgments of worth do not involve any action characteristic of the intellect, but possess a subjective validity of their own independently of the avouchment of the reasoning faculty that they represent objective reality. If this claim could be made good, Mr. Mallock's position would not be so obviously obnoxious to the charge of question-begging. An assertion, however, more arbitrary and more destitute of foundation could not well be conceived of. As we shall see presently, even Mr. Mallock himself is forced to admit that the validity of a value-judgment depends on its correspondence to objective fact.

3. Mr. Mallock's objection to contemporary methods of religious defense was that our apologists attempt to "meet science on its own ground." We were, therefore, led to expect that the basis of belief to be proposed by Mr. Mallock would lie outside of the domain of science. We have just seen how he has attempted to carry out this project by drawing a hard and fast line between the world of objective facts and the world of subjective values. Our concern now is to inquire whether this distinction is well-founded. Is it true that the validity of moral "judgment of value" is altogether independent of theoretical "judgments of existence"? This question can be best answered by a consideration of those very judgments of value in which Mr. Mallock finds the practical basis of theism. "Science," he tells us, "can offer no opinion as to the truth of the belief in the sanctity of human life" (p. 243). And again: "We are brought to the chief and to the last of those questions with regard to which science can tell us nothing, viz., Is the spiritual, intellectual, and social development of the human race a fact which has any meaning or has it none? This is a question which cannot be answered by an appeal to external evidence. It can be answered only by an act which is at once an act of belief, of common sense

and of will, an act which for practical purposes, creates the truth it affirms" (p. 259). In the first place, is there no judgment of existence involved in the assertion that human life possess sanctity? To possess sanctity is to have a certain spiritual worth. Now it cannot be asserted that a combination of material particles, no matter how skillfully organized, by the action of physical forces, has spiritual worth. The only thing that can have spiritual worth is a spiritual subject that *exists*. Secondly, let us consider the assertion that "human progress has a supreme significance." The expression "human progress" may be taken in two senses. By progress the evolutionary monist would understand merely a continuous change resulting in an increasing complexity of structure and diversity of function—a readjustment of matter and motion. In this sort of progress there is no qualitative difference between higher and lower. If we suppose this to be a true description of human development, then, as Mr. Mallock says: "What we have been accustomed to call the highest development of humanity are in no objective sense higher than what we call the lowest" (p. 273). But when Mr. Mallock speaks of human progress as having a meaning, he refers to something quite different. He refers to a process of development in which the higher is qualitatively and eternally superior to the lower. This, he tells us, is the only sense in which human progress can be said to have supreme value. Hence, Mr. Mallock has plainly involved himself in a contradiction. He assured us, first that the standard of truth for value-judgments is entirely subjective: and now he admits that the most important of all such judgments—"the one which embraces all others" (p. 259), depends for its validity upon the correspondence of its subject, viz., human progress, with objective reality. If what we have "been accustomed to call the highest development of humanity are in no objective sense, higher than what we call the lowest," then it is clear that human progress can have no particular worth. Whence we conclude that this judgment of value, like the former one concerning the sanctity of human life, involves a scientific, *i. e.*, intellectual, judgment of the objective existence of its subject.

And what is true of these two is obviously true of all judgments of value whatsoever. If they are not to be mere "air-drawn" formulas, the subject of predication must have real existence.

It must not be inferred from this that Mr. Mallock's argument is to be rejected because—contrary to his opinion—it involves an act of reason. Quite the reverse. What we wish to make plain is that Mr. Mallock has been unable to discover any defense of theism which does not involve a judgment of the intellect, and consequently that he is illogical in clinging to this particular argument whilst rejecting the numerous other arguments for theism which have precisely the same basis. Indeed this very argument which Mr. Mallock employs, has been familiar to Catholic philosophers, time out of mind. But they were careful to provide for it a valid foundation, and to recognize that, at best, it is of a supplementary character. The source of Mr. Mallock's error lies, first, in overlooking the subordinate character of the argument, and secondly, in repudiating the foundation on which it depends for its validity. We have already seen his denial of the principle of contradiction. Our next concern is with his attempt to make a non-rational motive the sole basis of theistic belief.

4. We have now arrived at our fourth and final inquiry regarding Mr. Mallock's Apologetics, viz., what grounds have we for supposing that this basic "judgment" itself corresponds to objective reality? A conclusion possesses no more validity than its premises. In order, therefore, that we may have a reasonable basis for believing in the doctrines of theism, we must be assured of the validity of the belief on which they are founded.

The act by which we assent to this fundamental proposition, Mr. Mallock tells us, is an instinctive, not a cognitive act. "It is an act of belief, of common sense, and of will, which for practical purpose creates the truth it affirms" (p. 259). To begin with, this marvellous act of will is not an act of belief or judgment, in any proper sense, at all. The act of assent necessarily demands an intellectual element. A reasoned atheist cannot be a deliberate, a voluntary, theist. As Professor

Flint excellently points out, "There is no mere 'will to believe.' A merely willed belief is a sham belief, no real belief."¹

If this sham belief is the only basis we have for our assent to the doctrine of theism and the principles of the moral order, there is nothing left for us but moral skepticism. It is small consolation to be told this act of the will "for practical purposes creates the truth it affirms," if the fact stands that all the evidence is against the validity of this belief. "All the facts of the universe, mental and physical," Mr. Mallock tells us, "form an absolute affirmation of monism which is fatal to each of the essential doctrines of religion." We have, therefore, not the slightest knowledge, direct or indirect, of the existence of the moral world. We cannot even legitimately guess that it exists. In such a condition, to will to believe that human progress has more than an ephemeral value, that human life is more than

A moment's halt—a momentary taste,
Of being from the well amid the waste,

would be an act of mental dishonesty, productive only of a subjective delusion—an act properly reprobated by every reasonable man.

To make confusion worse confounded, Mr. Mallock proceeds to justify this act of mental duplicity, by telling us that our assent to the existence of the cosmic world is consummated by a similar act of self-deception. The external world, he says, is not apprehended by a cognitive act, for "the senses merely give men certain internal ideas . . . and reason instead of supporting the inference that the causes (in which these ideas originate), must be external objects, entirely fails, as all thinkers now admit, to assure us of the existence of anything outside our individual selves" (p. 275). The act by which we apprehend and accept the comic world is instinctive, not cognitive. Consequently there is no evidence known to us for the existence of the external world, nor does Mr. Mallock venture to assert that in case of external existence, the instinctive act, by which we assent to it, will "create the

¹ "Agnosticism," p. 453.

truth it affirms"—even "for practical purposes." Mr. Mallock had in mind to confirm us in the delusion that a moral world exists; what he had accomplished is to leave our belief in the reality of the external world not a leg to stand on. In trying to extricate himself from the unsavory implications of moral skepticism, he has hopelessly entangled himself in the meshes of universal skepticism.

Not only does his practical basis of theistic belief involve the denial of the slightest knowledge on our part, concerning even the existence either of the moral order, or of the cosmic; it involves, likewise, a denial of the validity of the reasoning process. For not only does reason not make the external world known to us, but "it is a guide, if we follow it faithfully, not to belief but to skepticism" (p. 276). Hence, in order to perform the act of instinctive belief by which we assent to the existence of external objects, we must repudiate the cogency of logical inference and condemn the intellectual faculty as untrustworthy. Since our cognitive faculties are thus unreliable we cannot even remotely conjecture that we ourselves exist. The *eviction* of reason, in the name of reason, is complete. In his argument for theism Mr. Mallock has found it necessary to rest the cornerstone of his new edifice on a triple foundation, viz., first, a denial of the principle of contradiction; second, a denial of the trustworthiness of our cognitive faculties; and third, a denial of the validity of the reasoning process. Such is "the firm intellectual basis of religious belief"—such is the "intellectual road" by which Mr. Mallock proposes to enable the honest doubter to "reach again a position of religious certainty"!

It is fortunate for the cause of religion that Mr. Mallock has not been more successful in his attack on the existing methods of theistic Apology than he has been in his attempt to construct a new and more stable basis for religious belief. For, in view of his "ridiculous and ignominious failure" to discredit those lines of religious defense which are traditional in Catholic philosophy, we may still safely persevere in our religious convictions.

While Mr. Mallock has failed to provide a new basis for the doctrines of theism, it cannot be denied that his study of the theistic problem will have a beneficial influence on contemporary Apologetics. It is valuable, however, not for its contribution to the defense of religion, but rather as a sign of warning against a prevailing tendency in present day Apologies for theism, viz., the tendency to discredit and minimize the rational element in religious assent, and to emphasize unduly the non-rational element. The absurd extreme to which Mr. Mallock has carried this tendency will doubtless do something to restore the study of the basis of religious assent to saner and safer methods.

EDWIN V. O'HARA.

ACADEMY OF APOLOGETICS,
ST. PAUL SEMINARY.

BOOK REVIEWS.

History of Philosophy. By William Turner, S.T.D. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1903. 8°, pp. x + 674.

The modern demand for good text-books has been met in nearly all departments of knowledge and even in those sciences which are known as "philosophical." That in this line of production American scholarship has been peculiarly successful is a fact that is in keeping with the practical tendencies of our country. But hitherto the history of philosophy has been accessible mainly in the form of translations from the German. American manuals are rare. Were utility the only criterion, the present work is timely; Dr. Turner has given us an excellent text-book.

Viewing the book as a whole one notes, as its salient features, clearness, conciseness and proportion. The task of presenting within narrow limits the essentials of the various systems is not easy; and it is still more difficult to give each its due share of exposition. In both respects, Dr. Turner has succeeded. The result is especially important for mediæval philosophy. Scholasticism, which has so often been hurried over with scant justice by historians, appears in its true character; and its relations to earlier systems and to modern philosophy are well defined. That the work of Schoolmen should receive sympathetic treatment from a Catholic writer, was to be expected. But this sympathy does not prevent our author from discovering the merit in other philosophers whose teachings are far removed from the thought and the principles of Scholasticism. The treatment throughout is marked by calm objective appreciation.

The brief introduction which precedes each of the larger divisions, the references to the literature under each chapter and the statement of each philosopher's historical position, are details of method which will prove helpful to the student. Much care has also been taken in bringing out, under separate paragraphs with appropriate headings, the more important topics and in grading the print so as to show at a glance the relative value of the points under discussion.

The book commends itself to all who are interested in the study of philosophy. The beginner will find in it just that outline of history which he needs; and the more advanced student will be encouraged by its suggestions and indications to a deeper investigation

of those problems which, in our day as in the past, have called out the energies of truly great minds.

EDWARD A. PACE.

The Pope and the People. Select letters and addresses on Social Questions. By His Holiness Pope Leo XIII. New and Revised edition. New York: Benziger, 1903.

Les Béatitudes De L'Evangile et Les Promesses De La Démocratie Sociale. Par Mgr. Schmitz. Traduit par l'abbé L. Colin. Paris: Lethielleux, 1903. Pp. 320.

Les Grèves. Par Léon de Seilhac, Bibliothèque d'économie sociale. Paris: Leeooffre, 1903. Pp. 257.

Cartells et Trusts. Par E. Martin Saint-Léon, Bibliothèque d'économie sociale. Paris: Leeooffre, 1903. Pp. 248.

1. The Catholic Truth Society has rendered a real service to students of the social questions who are interested in the Catholic point of view, in publishing for us in a popular form the most important social encyclicals of the Holy Father.

The volume before us contains the three papal letters of 1878, 1891, and 1901, on socialism and social democracy; one addressed to a delegation from the workingmen's clubs of France, and the letters on liberty, marriage, the reunion of Christendom, the duties of Christians as citizens, and the Christian life.

An introduction to the collection is written by Mr. Devas; the paragraphs throughout are synopsized on the margin of the page. There is a good table of contents. In this form these important documents are accessible to all students. There is no reason why the collection should not be widely circulated among students and Catholics in the United States.

2. The author of this work was the well-known coadjutor bishop of Cologne who died in 1899. His great and intelligent interest in the coöperation with social reform wherever his priestly ministrations brought him, won for him the title *der soziale Bischof*. As an organizer leader and orator he was especially gifted.

In the volume before us we find a devotional commentary on the Beatitudes and a comparison for purpose of criticism between them and what we may call the socialist beatitudes. The spirit and point of view in the work are traditional; much stress is laid on conditions in life and possibly too little on personal or individual superiority to them. For instance we find riches and the rich generally condemned, poverty and the poor generally lauded: the vices of the rich and the

the
So
and
no-
L.
ale.
que
stu-
point
ant
378,
l to
ters
of
the
age.
stant
the
ath-
hop
t in
ions
gan-
the
hem
oint
ions
y to
ned,
the

virtues of the poor are brought to our attention, while the virtues of the rich and the vices of the poor largely escape notice. The little volume is useful, as far as a devotional commentary can be useful, but it would serve the cause of reform much more effectually were it to stimulate the sense of personal responsibility more and emphasize less external conditions.

3. This volume on strikes contains a comprehensive survey of conditions in France, of the relation of the strike to the civil law, the socialistic attitude, the documents concerning a number of recent strikes, and the various forms of strikes in France. The concluding portion of the volume contains a digest of the laws on conciliation and arbitration. The book is full of positive information which is, of course, interesting to students of strike problems.

4. M. Saint Léon presents in this volume a comprehensive review of the trust problem. He has taken into account all the available recent literature produced in Germany, Austria, France and the United States, and has made a clear, concise résumé of information bearing on the origin, history, structure, financeering, advantages and the evils of trusts, together with the legislation concerning them. It is the first work of the kind in French, so far as we know.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

Synopsis Theologie Moralis. I. De Pénitentia, Matrimonio, Ordine. Ad. Tanquery, S. S. Paris: 1903. 8°, pp. 628 and 33.

This is the first of a series of volumes on Moral Theology, that are owing to the scholarly pen of Dr. Tanquery, formerly professor in St. Mary's Seminary at Baltimore. Readers of the BULLETIN are acquainted with his manual of Dogmatic Theology. (Cf. ——.)

The volume before us is intended as a text-book, comprising, as it does, the lectures which the author has regularly given in the seminary. He follows in general the traditional line, writing under the guidance of standard theologians. There is, of course, not much opportunity for newness in the doctrines on penance, matrimony, and orders, once the historical point of view is excluded. How that point of view may be yet introduced into doctrinal treatises intended for seminary use, is still a problem. Otherwise, the work is up to date, and its ample bibliography shows a wide acquaintance with the most recent literature, especially in English. Two characteristics will commend this volume to students: the author has abandoned the framework of casuistry, and he has embodied many practical suggestions bearing on the active work of the ministry. The style throughout is

direct and clear, and the treatment of subjects is complete. The work will serve admirably its purpose as a text-book for seminarians.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

Our Benevolent Feudalism. By W. J. Ghent. New York: Macmillan, 1903. 3d edition.

This volume has had the interesting fate of having been warmly welcomed and greatly abused by reviewers. The early third edition gives evidence of the fact that at any rate it has been widely read. The author in the preface to this edition gives us an amusing résumé of the reviews which the work has received. It contains a history and a prophecy; a review of present industrial political and social conditions, and a prediction concerning the benevolent feudalism which is to succeed the actual organization of society. As a review of tendencies it is surely interesting, even eloquent, yet it may not satisfy serious students, and may mislead the superficial. Prophecy is generally valuable in inverse ratio to its quantity and assurance. It is difficult to believe with the author that the future state predicted will be the logical outcome of actual tendencies, or, being the logical result of actual tendencies, that it will be realized. History does not run along the lines of logic. Nor is it necessary to believe with the author that there is no middle term between the coöperative commonwealth and benevolent feudalism.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

The Question-Box Answers: Replies to questions received on missions to non-Catholics. By Rev. Bertrand L. Conway of the Paulist Fathers. New York: The Catholic Book Exchange, 1903. 8°, pp. v + 589.

In his preface to this book Cardinal Gibbons states that it "answers in a brief and popular manner the most important questions actually received by the author during the past five years of missionary activity in all parts of the United States from Boston to Denver." These words of praise are weighty, coming as they do from one who has himself prepared a work of the same nature, long since become one of the most popular books of the nineteenth century. Fr. Conway gathers under more than sixty titles a multitude of objections received by the Diocesan Missionaries on their apostolic tours here and there in the United States. Not all of them affect immediately the special tenets of Catholicism. The rule of faith, the "notes" of the true Church, politico-ecclesiastical matters, peculiar institutions of Catholicism like celibacy, abstinence, fasting and

indulg
the Sa
are o
able t
mind
teenth
errone
needs
this m
age An
theolog
really
the A
lieving
"Atlan
doctrin
Roman
instruc
statisti
The
mecum
library
trine"
"Since
style i
simple
sufficie
that a
cision.
what i
or disc
own to
be an
Thus,
biblio
logical
in Cat
be nur
this m
graphs
might
the pa

indulgences, come in for a large meed of explanation. The Mass, the Sacraments, the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, the life to come, are other sources of ignorance or misunderstanding. It is remarkable to what an extent these average objections of the non-Catholic mind square with the original polemics of Protestantism in the sixteenth century, or when they are new, are nearly all drawn from erroneous views of the great lines of the history of the Church. It needs no profound work like Moehler's *Symbolism* to grapple with this material—one would think after reading the book that the average American mind had been little touched by the advanced Protestant theological literature of the last two centuries. If these objections really represent the elements of religious doubt and hesitation in the American mind as regards Catholicism, there is reason for believing the assertion of Mr. Henry Sidgwick in a late issue of the "Atlantic Monthly," viz., that there is no longer any insurmountable doctrinal obstacle to the reunion of the Protestant churches with the Roman Church on the basis of her actual teaching. There are other instructive thoughts suggested by the examination of these curious statistics.

This little catechism may rightly hope to become a popular vademecum. Its place is already marked in the average Catholic home library besides the "Faith of Our Fathers" and the "Catholic Doctrine" of Faa di Bruno not to speak of older works like Hay's "Sincere Christian" and Milner's "End of Controversy." The style is quite suitable to the scope of the work—direct, clear, and simple. There is a sustained effort to make known frankly and sufficiently the elements of Catholic truth and discipline in a diction that avoids theological phraseology without losing fulness and precision. The writer does not try to say all that might be said, but only what is needed to make clear the immediate vision of his opponent or disciple. Such a book is equipped to take care of itself, to be its own tongue, its own commentary. Its circulation should therefore be an unlimited one. Improvements will no doubt be suggested. Thus, the titles of all books cited are indeed printed in a special bibliography, but they might be again grouped with others in a logical order, to furnish a course of regular and progressive reading in Catholic theology and history. The titles of chapters ought to be numbered both in the text and in the table of contents, and with this might be combined a progressive numbering of all the paragraphs. Where an index-subject includes several references, it might be well to introduce the practice of indicating in heavier type the page or pages where an objection is most efficiently dealt with.

Finally, we cannot help suggesting that a companion volume of "Select Readings" be issued, drawn, when possible, from eloquent non-Catholic writers, and by cross-references made to act as a companion or key to certain important lines of objection. We wish Father Conway and his co-laborers an ever-growing measure of success in the immense vineyard that has been allotted to them. Here grow brambles, it is true, and here are the ruins of a rich cultivation—but here also are fertile soil, abundant sap, racy if wild fruit, the traces of former success and comfort, consoling and inspiriting evidences of former unity and communion. Only the persistent and ingenious husbandry of charity may hope to reclaim these lost provinces from the moral desolation that has fallen or is impending over them—but it is precisely in Catholicism that the Almighty has planted the inexhaustible reservoir of charity, as wide as the world and humanity, and as inexhaustible as the divine love itself.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

The Teaching of History and Civics in the elementary and the secondary school. By Henry E. Bourne. New York: Longmans, 1902. 8°, pp. 385.

Professor Bourne has earned the gratitude of teachers by this useful compilation. In it is to be found good instruction as to the origins of historical scholarship, the progress of historical teaching in Europe and the United States, the value and scope of historical teaching, the choice of books and of subject-matter, the methods of teaching. Skeleton courses are then mapped out for the study of ancient, mediæval and modern history. As a handbook or guide the work will render excellent service in the higher grades of our schools. It is especially useful to teachers. Its tone is habitually respectful towards Catholicism. The writer betrays a varied learning, good judgment, and a liberal historical training that enables him to deal largely and philosophically with our human experience, also to point out to the non-Catholics who read his book certain pitfalls into which they are easily led by inherited prejudice.

At the same time we cannot but regret the want of a similar work written by a Catholic hand. The history of humanity takes on another appearance when written from the viewpoint of the Catholic Church. Problems, ideas, institutions, that seem of slight or remote interest to the non-Catholic mind, are of importance to us. We look on the Church as a divine and perfect society, and on the other world as her terminus ad quem. Our sympathies go out naturally to her great chiefs, and we seize with a subtle instinct certain super-national

principles
Catholic
in our
of, or p
more ne
an intro
modern
we have
cannot v
in the b
neglect.

Three
ing t
Gaug
MSS
intro
theolo
Arthu
of St
the F
for t
Tipog
Disru
of the f
In the ci
the seat
sequences
in heresi
political
that had
sults of t
modern v
by the i
dated in
were cut
the Nesto
Monophy
heirlooms
ogy goes

principles and tendencies that are foreign or abhorrent to non-Catholics. As to bibliography we are aware of many excellent works, in our own and in other tongues, that the non-Catholic seldom hears of, or perhaps traces with some difficulty. There is, perhaps no work more needed for our Catholic colleges seminaries and academies than an introduction to the study of history, particularly of mediæval and modern history, written from our domestic standpoint. Indeed until we have produced such a work with its pertinent bibliographies, we cannot very well complain if our Catholic historical literature is left in the background. Our own modesty is often the cause of such a neglect.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Three Letters of Philoxenus, Bishop of Mabbôgh (485-519), being the letter to the monks, the first letter to the monks of Beth-Gaugal, and the letter to the Emperor Zeno. Edited from Syriac MSS. in the Vatican Library, with an English translation, an introduction to the life works and doctrines of Philoxenus, a theological glossary and an appendix of bible quotations, by Arthur Adolph Vaschalde, Member of the Society of the Priests of St. Basil, Licentiate of Theology. A dissertation presented to the Faculty of Philosophy of The Catholic University of America for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Printed at Rome, Tipografia della R. Accademia dei Lincei, 1902. 8°, pp. xv + 190.
Disruption and dissolution are written large over the latter half of the fifth century of Roman imperial history and the Christian era. In the civil order the barbarian dominated the West, and threatened the seat of empire itself. In the religious order the subtlest consequences of Arianism were in various ways working themselves out in heresies that borrowed a curious viability from the confused political surroundings and from a "renouveau" of national sentiment that had long been smothered or offset in Egypt and Syria. The results of these revolutions were far-reaching. To no small extent the modern world comes down in direct line from the conditions outlined by the immediate predecessors of Justinian (527-565), and consolidated in his long and memorable reign. Great bodies of Christians were cut off, from both imperial and religious unity as in the case of the Nestorians, and from orthodox communion as in the case of the Monophysites. They could not but take with them many precious heirlooms of ecclesiastical belief and discipline—our polemical theology goes back frequently to their ancient creeds and praxis for con-

firmation of Catholic teaching. They also took with them old Christian systems of education, valuable libraries, habits of theological defence and attack, a knowledge of the dialectic and the rhetoric of the schools, and useful traditions of secular knowledge. And while it is true that the life-sap of unity no longer flowed in these immense decaying branches, it is also true that for centuries they lived with a measure of success and prestige on the provisions they took away from the vast stores of Byzantine life and learning. Indeed, it was through them that Arabic Islam learned how to administer the civilization it had conquered, and even competed one day with the Christian Orient on its own ground and in its own beloved sciences.

Readers of Duval's "Histoire de la Littérature Syriaque" (Paris, 2d ed., 1900) do not need to be told to what extent that rich department of Christian learning is dependent on the writings of the Monophysite scholars of the fifth and sixth centuries. As the Council of Trent roused every Protestant pen to opposition, so the Council of Chalcedon (451) roused to manifold activity, not only the immediate followers of Eutyches but the more dangerous and numerous body who read in the outcome of the Council a challenge to both Alexandria and Antioch. From both quarters came a response in the shape of polemico-theological literature, but bilingual Syria bore for several reasons, the brunt of this literary warfare. Philoxenus of Mabbôgh, Severus of Antioch, John of Tella, Jacob of Serûgh, Jacob Baradaeus, are names familiar to every Church historian as vigorous defenders of Monophysitism and lights of that creed both in Greek and Syriac.

Until lately, the Syriac writings of this school were comparatively, not to say entirely, neglected. Philoxenus in particular, has been almost entirely studied in the accounts of his Greek opponents, although he was a voluminous writer of Syriac prose on the scriptures, liturgy, asceticism and dogma. Competent scholars agree that his writings are among the best specimens of the golden age of Syriac literature. Professor Guidi, in particular, praises the exquisite purity of his diction, as well as the eloquence and strength of his style. Assemani long ago called him a most elegant writer of Syriac, though a "most corrupt man" and a "pernicious heretic." Among his own he is from the beginning one of their four great doctors, known particularly as The Interpreter, and not inferior to Saint Ephrem himself. Only a very few of his writings have been published in the original. Before 1873, there were accessible to us only a Latin translation of two liturgical pieces and some brief extracts in the *Bibliotheca Orientalis* of Assemani.

Out of the large body of unpublished manuscripts of Philoxenus, Dr. Vaschalde has selected the three letters mentioned on the title page of his work. We leave to the competent public the decision on the philological merits of his work—so superior a Syriac scholar as Professor Guidi of Rome was highly pleased with Dr. Vaschalde's treatment of the Syriac text. He has also carefully collated the Syriac text of these three letters with the originals in the Vatican Library.

The introduction sets forth more fully than can be found elsewhere the details of the checkered career of Philoxenus, a Persian by birth, born between 425 and 450, and deceased in exile, probably murdered, in 523. Violent partisan, active Monophysite bishop, founder of a long-lived heresy, and versatile writer and preacher—he may be not inappropriately termed the Saint Jerome of the Monophysites. In these three letters are found many interesting considerations on the Incarnation and the Trinity, apart from his heterodox belief concerning the two natures in Christ—a belief to which he furnished the philosophical and theological basis on which it sought to justify itself. These writings furnish several useful evidences and confirmations of the antiquity and universality of certain Catholic doctrines and practices. Thus, pages 76–78 offer pleasing proof of the belief of the Syriac Church in the real presence of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament. Elsewhere (p. 32) the consecration of the bishop of the Alexandrian Acephali shows a ritual identical with the local Roman ritual described by Mgr. Duchesne in his “*Origines du culte chrétien*” (Paris, 3d ed., 1903). His teaching concerning the Blessed Virgin as Mother of God is perfectly orthodox (p. 43) and very probably (p. 70) his writings furnish confirmation of the common Syriac belief in the Immaculate Conception. His teaching on original sin is in keeping with the doctrine of the Church (p. 69)—only in the doctrine of one nature in Christ, and the manner of the union of the humanity with the God-head does his divergence from orthodoxy become clear. With Eutyches he maintained only “one nature incarnate,” but he differed from the latter in his explanation of the union—the strict Eutychians teaching a commingling of the natures, while Philoxenus taught the contrary and held that the two natures formed after the Incarnation a composite nature, somewhat after the manner of the union of body and soul in man. He could, therefore, maintain against the compulsory docetism of the Eutychians that the body of Christ was real. It is interesting also to note (p. 76) that the teaching of Philoxenus on the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son is in perfect harmony with the

current belief of the Syriac Church manifested in a canon of the Synod of Seleucia (410), which is also one of the oldest documents of Syriac literature, a doctrine also held by Jacob of Serugh and other famous Monophysite teachers.

The theologian and historian will regret that an index of the subjects treated in the introduction and translation is wanting. The theological glossary and the index of bible quotations and Greek words can not replace the "index rerum." St. Gregory of Nazianzen (p. 7) should be of Nazianzus or Nazianzos.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

J. J. Rousseau et Le Rousseauisme. Par Jean-Félix Nourrisson. Paris: Fontemoing, 1903. 8°, pp. xiv + 507.

M. Paul Nourrisson, son of the illustrious Catholic philosopher of the Institut and the Collège de France, has collected in the volume before us the lectures on Rousseau delivered by his father in the last period of his life. We have already called attention in the BULLETIN (II, pp. 392-397) to the method and spirit that Nourrisson brings to the study of master-characters in history. His Saint Augustine and his Voltaire will long remain as chefs d'œuvres of a manner that unites searching analysis of life and writings with a synthesis broad, equitable, and complete. In these pages we find Rousseau as he lived—a restless wanderer, vain, immoral, self-opinionated. His disorderly youth, his meanness and ingratitude, his outer subserviency and inward rebellion, are painted in his own language, no less vividly than his splendid gifts of style, his intense emotionalism, his sensitive impressionable fancy, his absolute prophetic attitude. Yet this bundle of contradictions stands like a Moses at the end of the eighteenth century, not to point out a promised land in the future, but to call society back to the paradise that men had destroyed through love of civilization. The French Revolution was the result of the little rift that the music-master of Chambéry opened in the public opinion of France, and more than one other far-reaching innovation owes its viability to the burning eloquence of this Mirabeau of French prose, this cosmopolitan vagabond of genius who wrote in the Emile, the Contrat Social, the Profession de Foi du Vieaire Savoyard, the Nouvelle Héloïse and his "Confessions" the great conquering evangel of modern naturalism. Into it he infused as none before or after him a proselytizing aggressive spirit—above all, he broke in rudely and disastrously on the time-honored influences of Christianity on the education of Europe. How ill qualified he was to take up the rôle of an apostle of the new education may be seen from the twenty chapters

through which M. Nourrisson follows his career from his birth in Geneva to his death in the solitude of Ermenonville.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

History of the Roman People. By Charles Seignobos, translation edited by William Fairley, Ph.D. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1902. 8°, pp. 528.

This elementary history of the Roman people has certain advantages. The style is graphic and pleasing, and the information is quite up to the latest standards. Brief tables of the "sources" and of the best works in English are given at the end of the chapter, also (Appendix F) a list of such English translations of the original sources as have been printed. The maps are admirably done, and of the numerous illustrations most are satisfactory. It is an advantage that the story of the Roman Empire should be carried on to the death of Charlemagne, as the youthful student thus acquires some sense of its power and charm. It might have been well to indicate the fact that, theoretically, the Roman Empire ceased only with the Fall of Constantinople (1453). In treating of the Christian religion and Rome, M. Seignobos is habitually correct and sympathetic—the editor attempts in a foot-note to offset the weight of his statements concerning St. Peter at Rome and the early preëminence of that see—a fact openly acknowledged by Harnack in the famous "excursus" of the first volume of his History of Dogma, likewise in his late essay on certain lost letters of the Roman clergy to Saint Cyprian. Elsewhere, M. Seignobos himself does not give (p. 469) a sufficient account of the development of the papal authority. It is not correct to attribute loosely to the Church the "sophistication with Greek philosophy" that the Gnostic heresies were responsible for. That churchmen in a Graeco-Roman world spoke the philosophical language of their time is no proof that they diluted Christian teaching with Greek speculation. We miss in the "literature" on Christianity any reference to De Rossi's great labors made known in English by Northcote and Brownlow, also by Lowrie—indeed all Catholic literature seems neglected. The word "monkish" on page 466, is out of place, especially as the translator is not consistent, using elsewhere the proper term "monastic." The judgment on the religion of Charlemagne (p. 479) is simply false. With these reserves, the work may be commended to teachers as an excellent personal help in the school-room.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Mediaeval Europe from 395 to 1270. By Charles Bémont and G. Monod, translated by Mary Sloan, with notes and revisions by George Burton Adams. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1902. 8°, pp. 556.

The names of MM. Bémont and Monod are well enough known in historical schools to compel a respectful reading of any work due to their collaboration. This manual of mediaeval history is not unworthy of their great learning, critical sense and narrative skill. Even in a translation these qualities are manifest. For its peculiar purpose we know no school summary of mediaeval history more intelligently planned. The text is rich and varied, the historical maps numerous, the sources and literature well chosen. Were it not that good English works on mediaeval history are not numerous, we might complain of the paucity of English books recommended. There is room for improvement, especially in the citation of English Catholic literature—thus, the work of Lingard on “Anglo-Saxon Antiquities” and the “Essays” of Cardinal Moran on the Early Irish Church are writings of classical character that might well be mentioned.

We are more inclined to complain of the Gallican, even Erastian, tone of the manual. It is Launoi and Fleury all through. In spite of a courteous phraseology the papacy seems grasping, ambitious, selfish. Mediaeval emperors like Otto I. and Henry I. reform the ecclesiastical conditions “for the benefit of the state”—a formula that the “sources” do not justify. The relations between Charlemagne and the papacy, and between the Ottos and the same, are treated from an unhistorical and partisan angle. The unhappy circumstances of the tenth-century papacy are relieved by no suitable narration of the circumstances through which the fine gold lost its color and the rich perfume its savor. It is not admitted by all critics that the famous “dictatus pape” are from the hand of Gregory VII. Nor is it certain that Hadrian I quoted for Charlemagne (p. 182) the Donation of Constantine. There is no better exposé of that fateful quarter of a century than Mgr. Duchesne’s “Premiers Temps de l’Etat Pontifical” (Paris, 1898). In his sane and critical pages (notably 79–91) all that the sources make known with certainty about the origin of the Donation is set down, nothing therefore of a knowledge or participation of Hadrian I. There is altogether too much passion among certain historians in dealing with this period, too much “reading into” the texts of their own fixed views, too much “Nuancirung” that would be given an ugly name were Catholic historians to indulge in it. The right of appeals was not first claimed or established by Nicholas I (p. 222) nor did he

thereby shatter the royal authority in the Carolingian world. Neither was the Frankish Church forced (p. 178) to acknowledge its dependency on the Roman See. This is all better and more honestly told in Godefroid Kurth's "Origines de la Civilisation Moderne," or in Leeoy de la Marche "La Gaule Mérovingienne," not to say in the original texts themselves. In the latter the reader will look in vain for the shadings of feeling and assertions of principle, for the antithesis and suspicion that modern historians too often detect where they never existed. The portrait of St. Leger of Autun (p. 98) is not that which the learned Benedictine Cardinal Pitra has drawn in his fine life of that personage. The popes never took part in ecumenical councils on the same degree (p. 120) as other bishops—in the very first years of the Church's political triumph we see Pope Julius rebuking such great Eastern bishops as those of Antioch for violating the *ecclesiastical law* that reserved to him the convocation of important councils.

After all, it is not the errors of detail that affect the use of such a book—it is rather the unsympathetic attitude that it assumes wherever the political rôle of the papacy is up for consideration. Then the latter seems always an evil and dangerous culprit, somehow an enemy of society, the state, humanity, while its opponents are vaguely declared to be the representatives of enlightenment and equity. It is only just to say that very often distinctive Catholic institutions of the Middle Ages are treated in this work with profound respect and a sure sense of their place and workings in the raw centuries that beheld the rise of mediæval European humanity out of its wretched beginnings.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

La Vie Universitaire Dans L'Ancienne Espagne. Par Gustave Reynier. Paris: Picard, 1902. 8°, pp. 220.

It is a charming portrait of student life and habits that M. Reynier sketches for us in this little volume. All the romance of mediæval Spain is in it, though it treats only of students and teachers, of "pupilos, camaristas and capigorrones," of the Goliardic corporation of the "Tana," of the "Oposiciones" and "grados," the feasts and the fasts of the thousands who once sought learning at Salamanca and Alcalà. The former is the Oxford of Spain, and right proudly did she once inscribe on stone and bronze and parchment the inspiring words: *Omnium scientiarum princeps Salmantica docet*. Alcalà is the creation of Ximenes, almost at the gates of Madrid, and while the work of Ximenes endured, his splendid school flourished. To write

the history of universities in any land is to write the history of all profounder study as well as to measure their influence on society in all its forms—hence the instructive chapters on the rise, flourishing, and decadence of the universities of Spain. It is not necessary to subscribe fully to every appreciation of M. Raynier in order to enjoy his delightful book—perhaps no pages are more fascinating than those in which he describes the “Tana” or freemasonry of university vagabondage, and the “universitates silvestres,” those lonely and decadent little schools that Spanish generosity and individualism created in certain backwater-stretches of peninsular life.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

The Story of the Mormons from the Date of their Origin to the year 1901. By William Alexander Linn. New York: Macmillan, 1902. 8°, pp. 637.

No more fascinating book of American history has come before us in some years. The purpose of the writer is to present the actual facts of the origin, growth and consolidation of the most peculiar phenomenon of American religious life in the nineteenth century. Writings of the original Mormons, their periodical publications and correspondence, their autobiographies, histories of Utah and of Salt Lake City, by friend and foe, the national civil records,—above all, the Berrian collection of books, early newspapers and pamphlets on Mormonism owned by the New York Public Library, are the main sources of the narrative, and they permit a very accurate study of its external public life.

The student of Church History is arrested at every step by strangely familiar suggestions of primitive Christian life that are at once disfigured in the grotesque institutions of a Joseph Smith and a Brigham Young. Similarly all the outlines of a Jewish theocracy shine through the constitution of the Latter-Day Saints. That they have been able to reach the figure of 300,000 and control politically one of the great new states of the Union, not to say several, is another consideration of momentous import. The book of Mr. Linn deserves thoughtful reading. His plain unimpassioned narrative is a more powerful arraignment of Mormonism than any flaming denunciation of its evils could possibly be.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

The Papal Monarchy. By William Barry, D.D. New York: Putnam's, 1903. (Story of the Nations.) Pp. xxii + 435.

It is highly creditable to the publishers that they should have had the courage and good taste to select a Catholic for the historian of a subject which concerns Catholics so vitally. It is equally creditable to the historian that he has written with such fearlessness of the political errors and sins of the Papacy. Moreover, the work is above criticism, as a specimen of modern book-making. The style is easy, often brilliant. The portraiture of character is frequently vivid.

This said, we decline to subscribe unconditionally to the almost unanimous praise bestowed upon the book by reviewers, because, all in all, it strikes us as fundamentally weak by reason of its one-sidedness. Whether this be due to the author's embarrassment at being a Catholic or to lack of power of perspective we cannot say, but at all events he has given a picture of the mediæval papacy which can hardly cause either its friends or its enemies to increase their respect for it. This is apparent not so much in any error of fact, as in a certain tone, spirit, style which remind one continually of Gibbon. Verily it reads much like Gibbon whom, we venture to suspect, the author has followed rather closely despite the very good bibliography noted in the preface. Perhaps this is a harsh judgment, but it is at least curious to note the remark on p. 309. "I happen to be writing this page of history in the garden at Lausanne where Gibbon added the last stroke to his immense and as yet unrivalled panorama of the Roman Empire in decline." Now, ordinarily Father Barry's post-office address, even when engaged in his literary labors, would excite in us only a very languid interest, but it becomes of some importance in the present case when we read further down his endorsement of Gibbon as a "not unkindly" critic. Well! tastes differ. We have read Gibbon from cover to cover, and separate chapters frequently, and the impression created was that his work is by all odds the most insidious and dishonest arraignment of the Papacy yet written, and that is saying a good deal. If an author then has this opinion of Gibbon it is not unjust to class him as a disciple.

The effect of his book is as likely to be injurious as otherwise. The average non-Catholic will not have his prejudices against the Papacy lessened; and he will fail to see the truth of the closing eulogium to the effect that the benefits of the Papal monarchy "out-number by far its abuses." Such a conclusion does not logically follow from the facts as presented. At best it might be taken as a funeral oration over the corpse of a poor relative. What is worse, this prejudice will be extended to the spiritual side of the Papacy because

the author does not clearly separate the political from the spiritual aspects. In fact, we fail to see exactly what he means by "Papal Monarchy." On the other hand, the ultramontane will not be converted from his political allegiance to the dead past, and thus will be defeated one of the objects which we suspect Father Barry had mainly in view. On the whole, then, despite the many excellencies of the book—its brilliancy in style and arrangement, its fearless candor—we must regret that the author let slip a splendid opportunity to write a first class essay. Whatever his work be, it is not an adequate presentation of the subject; it marks another failure among the many that have gone before it. The fundamental defect of all is a lack of perspective, and the presence of too much subjectivity.

LUCIAN JOHNSTON.

The Lords Baltimore and the Maryland Palatinate. Six lectures on Maryland Colonial History delivered before the Johns Hopkins University in the year 1902, by Clayton Coleman Hall, LL.B., A.M. Baltimore: John Murphy Company, 1903. Pp. xvii + 216.

It is worthy of note that some of the best monographs on Maryland colonial history have come from the pens of lawyers. Perhaps this is due to their legal training which gives them both the ability to handle evidence and the proper temper in which to discuss controversy. Both these qualities are strikingly evident in the present work from the pen of a distinguished member of the Baltimore bar. In his treatment of "Religious Toleration in Maryland" his method has been strictly objective, stating facts as he thought he found them and expressing no hypotheses. His views on this question are the same as those now generally accepted by Maryland's leading historians, though there is a freshness in the presentation of them which lends them a peculiar interest. His general view is that religious toleration in Maryland was "due to one man, the broad-minded proprietary, and not to any religious body." Whilst accepting this view in general we venture to be somewhat sceptical anent the opinion expressed on same page (page 83). "It is not necessary to assign the credit of this act" (of Toleration) "to the Roman Catholic Church or to any other religious body or to the Protestant majority in the Maryland Assembly." Now we fully agree that this Act was not due to either Catholicity or Protestantism, but, as said before, to the liberality of one man who was reflecting in himself the nascent tendency of his time towards religious freedom or, what is the same, religious compromise. But that sentence is awkward. The author will surely

pardon a little sensitiveness on the part of a Catholic who is quite anxious to give the credit of this Act to Catholicity merely in order to silence the current Protestant suspicion of the same as a foe of religious liberty. In which sense the question of authority does assume considerable importance, however little logical connection it may have with the fact in the eyes of the more intelligent few. Still less can we imagine the author asserting that the Maryland Assembly actually at the time had a "Protestant Majority," as he surely would not have thus gone against the accepted opinion to the contrary without giving proof. At best the sentence is squinting, and we confess our inability to make out just what it means.

However, this only by the way. As a whole the book is an able temperate and interesting contribution to the history of Maryland. The fact of its considering the subject chiefly from a biographical point of view lends it a novelty of its own. It is to be hoped that Mr. Hall will continue on in the work so well begun, and that all who come after him will write with the same objectivity.

LUCIAN JOHNSTON.

An Introduction to the History of Western Europe. By James Harvey Robinson, Professor of History in Columbia University. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1903. 8°, pp. xi + 714.

All in all, Professor Robinson has written an excellent manual. Obliged by the short space at his disposal to notice only the salient facts of history, he has used good judgment in his selection. From a typographical point of view, it is above criticism—the binding attractive, printing clear, profusely illustrated with maps and pictures of prominent places and personages, and well indexed. The style is easy and natural.

Great praise is also due the treatment of the matter. Above all, is the author to be congratulated upon the prevailing tone of impartiality when treating delicate periods of history such as the Reformation, French Revolution, and the like. Certainly, the book shows evidence that he has tried to be fair and tried with marked success. Although, of course, he writes from the standpoint of a non-Catholic he has succeeded generally in stating Catholic doctrines and practice correctly. It is therefore, with the most profound respect for the author's learning and spirit that we venture to point out some of the few blemishes in his book.

Not all Americans share his admiration for the works of Henry C. Lea (p. iv); in fact, that abler writer has vitiated his work with so

much bigotry and not a little ignorance that his labors are doomed to oblivion the very moment that an equally voluminous and more fair history is written. And, by the way, if Professor Robinson has time, he would do well to look up Catholic authorities for insertion in his contemplated "Readings in European History." A short reference to any general histories like those of Alzog or Hergenröther will supply them all.

Again, a confession of mortal sins is not (p. 211) a necessary condition of salvation in all cases. It is necessary only when possible. Then, too, "tradition, that is the practices and teachings of the Church" is not bound up with "inspiration" (p. 370); nor does it concern all "practices," whatever is meant by them. Also, it is hard to see what the author means by saying that the Franciscans came "under the spiritual authority of the Roman Church" because they received the "tonsure (224). Still more ambiguous is the statement that the saints "came to be invoked" in somewhat the same way as the ancient pagan gods (p. 19); and that the "protection of the papal possessions" was "made one with the observance of Christian faith" (p. 45). As to the divine origin of the Papacy, the author is, as might be supposed, not at all sympathetic (see pp. 21, 50, 64, 159, 163). But he is not abusive. Of Part I, the best and fairest chapter is that on the "Monks." That on the Crusades is neither sympathetic nor altogether fair, strange to say, whilst that on "Heresy and the Friars" shows the malign influence of Mr. H. C. Lea.

The treatment of both the Renaissance and the Reformation is in most respects admirable, although the author, perhaps unconsciously, does not give a fair comparative view of religious persecutions: he dwells upon those suffered by Protestants and refers rather casually to those inflicted by them upon Catholics. The chapters on the French Revolution are masterly and by far the best we know of in any similar manual. On the whole, the book is unusually able fair and interesting.

LUCIAN JOHNSTON.

Saint Victrice, Evêque de Rouen (IV-V century). Par E. Vacandard. Paris: Lecoffre, 1903. 8°, pp. 186.

Sainte Hildegarde (1098-1179). Par Paul Franche. Ibid., 1903. 8°, pp. 209.

1. This pen-picture of Saint Vietricius of Rouen is quite a *nouveauté*. Students of history will be grateful to the Abbé Vacandard for the local color and the scientific dress of his little book. From the standpoint of the history of ecclesiastical institu-

tions and canon law, Saint Vietricius is a figure of interest. His life illustrates the relations of the Church and the army in the Theodosian times, the development of the translation and veneration of the relics of martyrs, the revival of the missionary or apostolic temperament, the growth of monasticism, the history of Latin style, the universal character of papal authority and other details of ecclesiastical life previous to the overthrow of the civil prestige of the Eternal City. We recommend the perusal of this book to all lovers of early Church history—it is enough to say that it comes from the pen of the historian of Saint Bernard and Saint Ouen.

2. Such modern German historians of Sainte Hildegarde as Ludwig Clarus and Dr. Schmelzeis have not exhausted the perennial charm of the character and writings of the great mediæval prophetess. Görres "Mysticism," the Romantic movement in early nineteenth-century Germany, coupled with the completion of Cologne Cathedral and the mystical phenomena of Catharine Emmerich and others, did much to revive the cultus of the Sibyl of the Rhineland. Then Cardinal Pitra's enlarged reédition of her curious "Opera Omnia" gave a new impetus to the study of her times and her writings. In a way she recalls St. Catharine of Siena and St. Bridget of Sweden. An overpowering love drives her out upon the highways of the world as a voice of the Holy Spirit, to preach to the highest authorities a renewal of justice, charity, and faith. Her slight figure dominates the scene whereon moved a Conrad III and a Frederick Barbarossa, an Eugenius III, an Adrian IV, an Alexander III. Her extensive correspondence with the summities of civil and religious life, her position on the central Rhine as counsellor of all German society, her splendidly picturesque and Dantesque revelations, the possession and cultivation from infancy of an "inner light" or perlucid state in which the highest moral consciousness of her time reached its most acute stage, raise this extraordinary woman to a place among the permanent historic-religious influences of mediæval Catholicism, at a time when the Empire and the Church, the Orient and the Occident, feudalism, democracy and monarchy, were engaged in that multitudinous conflict whose consequences, foreseen and foretold by the prophetess, were the Renaissance and the Reformation.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Le Théâtre Français Au Moyen Age. Par Johan Mortensen, traduit du suédois par Emmanuel Philipot. Paris: Picard, 1903. 8°, pp. 254.

To what an extent is the French theatre of Corneille and Racine

the direct successor of the religious dramatic activity of the Middle Ages? Dr. Mortensen answers this question in a series of charming conferences delivered at Gothenbourg (Sweden) in 1899, and now rendered into elegant French. He traces the growth of the grave and ancient liturgical drama from the musically read "Lectiones" and the "antiphonal" chant of the mass, then that of the biblical drama from the representation of scenes and personages, chiefly typical of the Old Testament. In time the beloved lives of the saints furnish new material, especially elements of the marvelous and supernatural. Thus we have the "Mysteries" and the "Miracles" that abound from the early part of the twelfth century. Originally written in Latin, the vernacular French is substituted about the same time. Eventually local and comic features or "traits de moeurs," as well as subjects of romance and chivalry, get themselves adopted in these great popular representations which enthused the mediæval multitudes in a way that we can no longer easily comprehend. Vocal and instrumental music, absolute religious faith, native and popular artistic sense, mediæval love for democratic enjoyment, are auxiliary elements in the genesis of these original Christian manifestations of the dramatic temperament. In time this religious drama was organized, chiefly at Paris. As the Middle Ages wear away, the satirical, the personal, the didactic, gradually destroy or imperil the primitive theological character and purpose of all such plays. At Paris the Basoche, the Enfants sans souci, and the Confrérie de la Passion are the intermediaries of the dramatic novelties gradually introduced through the new forms of *moralités*, *farces*, *soties*, *histoires* and the like. It seems curious enough that it was the reaction against the Reformation that brought about in France the suppression of the last phases of the old mediaeval religious drama. But long ere this, it had been the common training-ground of the peculiar French genius for light comedy and delicate satire. There is much to glean in the work of Dr. Mortensen, even after the exhaustive treatises of the modern historians of French literature, like Aubertin and Petit de Julleville and specialists like Marius Sepet.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

The Creeds. An historical and doctrinal exposition of the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds. By Rev. Alfred G. Mortimer, D.D. New York: Longmans, 1902. 8°, p. 316.

Dr. Mortimer presents in this work a judicious selection of the most approved conclusions concerning the oldest formulas of Christian

faith. Caspari and Kattenbusch, Harnack and Zahn, Heurtley and Swainson, McGiffert and Swete, Ommaney and Burns, have left unstudied almost no detail or phase of investigation that could throw light on the process by which the primitive Christians came to look on these great "Creeds" as the mirrors or equivalent of absolute orthodoxy. In this work the reader may acquaint himself, in a summary way, with the chief details of the literary history of the creeds as drawn from the exhaustive works already mentioned. As a rule, the theological commentary of Dr. Mortimer adheres to the old line of Catholic exposition. In an appendix he reprints the oldest historical references to the Apostles' Creed. As a brief exposé of the history of the latter we prefer the little volume of Dr. Swete (*The Apostles' Creed*, London, 1894) and the erudite pages of our own Dr. Bardenhewer (*Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, Freiburg, 1902, Vol. I). The student of historical theology will always read with profit the article of the Abbé Vacandard on the history of the Apostles' Creed in the "*Revue des Questions Historiques*" (Vol. 66, pp. 329-377), similarly the learned disquisitions of the "*Theologische Quartalschrift*" of Tuebingen.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Un Siècle De L'Eglise De France. Par Mgr. Baunard. 3d ed. Paris: Poussielgue, 1902. 8°, pp. 538.

The former Rector of the Catholic University of Lille was an indefatigable writer in the service of Catholic truth and ideas. His "Victims of Doubt" and "Victories of Faith" are well known, likewise his lives of Saint Ambrose, of Cardinals Pie and Lavigerie, of Madame Barat, Madame Duchesne, and General De Sonis. His "Dieu dans l'Ecole" is a favorite work of Christian pedagogy for teachers and students in Catholic colleges. Experience, office and talent made him fit to draw an eloquent outline of the ecclesiastical history of France in the nineteenth century. The twenty-two chapters of the work deal with Pius VII and Napoleon, Gallicanism, the Catholic Party and Liberty, Learning and Eloquence, Pius IX and France, Christian Teaching, Priests and Religion, the Bishops and Roman Unity, Anti-Christianity and its results, the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, Mary Immaculate, Worship and Christian Art, Charity, Leo XIII, Anti-clericalism, the Political and Social Crisis, Theology and Philosophy, Pulpit and Press, Mission, Martyrdom, Saints and Holiness, the Two Cities. Under these rubries Mgr. Banard disposes a multitude of interesting phenomena of the life of French Catholicism since the Revolution. France has been so long

CUB

in the foremost rank of Catholicism that a century of her church history is equivalent to that of the entire Church as far as general experience, institutions, policy, action and suffering go.

The political institutions of the New World differ so much in their history spirit and operation from those of the Old World, most deeply rooted in France, that much of the political experience of Catholicism in that land is intelligible to us only by a serious effort of reflexion. Yet these political issues appear, from one point of view, to dominate and affect seriously the life of the Church in France. It is only when we are compelled to study it in miniature, as it were, that the far-reaching consequences of tradition and habit manifest themselves. Hence, all who would go to the root of the present situation in France would do well to peruse this book, not to adopt all the views of its author, but to rise with him to a view d'ensemble. He is inexact when he refers to the losses of American Catholicism—neither his figures nor his explanation will bear investigation. His judgments on the episcopate of France are marked by a certain severity; they do not, perhaps, allow for the great practical difficulties of the episcopal office in that land. One cannot say that Mgr. Baunard has refused to touch on the weakness of French ecclesiastical life and government; he is, however, quite conservative and stationary in his attitude toward all the later developments in the clergy of France—in more senses than one a priest "de la vieille roche."

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Mémoires De Langeron, General d'infanterie dans l'armée russe, Campagnes de 1812–1814 publiées d'après le manuscrit original. Par L. G. E. Paris: Picard (Société d'Histoire Contemporaine), 1902. 8°, pp. cxx + 524.

Mémoire De Ma Détenion Au Temple 1797–1799. Par P. Fr. de Rémusat, Introduction notes et commentaire, par Victor Pierre. Paris: ibid., 1903. 8°, pp. xlii + 191.

1. The French nobleman and émigré, Langeron, relates in this second volume of his mémoires the events of Napoleon's campaigns of 1812 to 1814, as seen from the Russian standpoint. The details of the retreat from Moscow and the passage of the Beresina are particularly interesting, likewise the portrait of Blücher. A lengthy preface brings to the study of these campaigns such information as only a military scholar can appreciate.

2. In the brief account of his two years imprisonment in the Temple during the Terror, M. de Rémusat, a respectable and innocent merchant of Marseilles, causes us to assist day by day at the reckless injustice and violence practiced in those trying years upon a multitude of harmless persons, caught up daily in the drag nets of the police, and left to languish in filth and starvation, when not borne away to instant execution. On the list of prisoners of the Temple as made out by M. de Rémusat we come across the names of Irishmen from Cork, Englishmen from London, and Americans from New York Boston and Philadelphia.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

La Bienheureuse Mère Marie De L'Incarnation (Madame Acarie)

1566-1618. Par Emmanuel de Broglie. Paris: Lecoffre, 1903.
8°, pp. 210.

Intimate knowledge of the social and political life of France in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is almost an heirloom in the De Broglie family. This little volume narrates the events which led to the foundation at Paris in 1602 of the first Carmelite monastery in France. Apropos of the share which fell to the lot of Madame Acarie, the distinguished author of "Fénelon à Cambrai" and of the literary existence of Mabillon, has drawn for us an exquisite portrait of the religious spirit and activity of France in the latter half of the sixteenth century. This rich "veuve parisienne," mother of six children, half ruined by her husband's political misfortunes through the overthrow of the Ligue and the triumph of Henri IV, finds time nevertheless, to devote herself to works of piety and charity, so well that all Paris soon recognizes in her a soul of exquisite distinction. Her salon is the rendezvous of a genuine spiritual Catholicism, and from it goes forth the generous idea of endowing France with establishments after the heart and the rule of Saint Theresa. M. de Broglie has sketched with a sure sense of proportion the rôle of Madame Acarie in this enterprise, the future record of which is equivalent to the moral history of the century of Bossuet and Fénelon—so closely interwoven is the Paris Carmel with the history of the governing classes of seventeenth-century France. His heroine died in the odor of sanctity; the cause of her canonization has been introduced at Rome since 1627. There is every reason to believe that France still produces specimens of that "âme française" which M. Brunetière declares profoundly and socially Catholic.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Histoire Du Moyen Age, depuis la chute de l'Empire Romain jusqu'à la fin de l'époque franque (476-950). Par Ch. Moeller, professeur à l'Université de Louvain. Paris: Fontemoing, 1898-1902. 8°, pp. xv + 397.

Professor Charles Moeller of Louvain is favorably known for his edition of the useful work of his father, Jean Moeller, entitled "Traité des études historiques" (Paris, 1887-1892). The volume before us presents the general political history of the first period of the Middle Ages. The special history, or that of mediæval institutions, is touched on but lightly, being reserved for another work. In each chapter only the substantial and necessary facts are narrated—there is but little philosophic consideration. The original authorities are always indicated in large type, also the classical works that deal with the subject. This book has many advantages as a manual for teaching and for self-instruction, and we hope that it will be much used in our Catholic colleges, at least by instructors. It needs an alphabetical index—without such a help manuals of history are stripped of half their value to the busy teacher and student.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Die Peschitta Zum Buche Der Weisheit, eine kritisch-geschichtliche Studie. By Joseph Holtzmann. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1903. Pp. xii + 152. \$1.25 net.

The author of this important contribution to the textual criticism of the Book of Wisdom examines (1) the condition of the *textus receptus* as we have it now; (2) the original from which it was translated; (3) the method followed by the translator; (4) the history of the translation.

His conclusions are briefly as follows: The various recensions of the Peschittian Book of Wisdom do not differ essentially. Indeed, they agree so well, even in their defects, that they all appear to come from one official text, much defaced by errors and interpolations. That original text was certainly in Greek. Once published, the Syriac translation was several times collated and brought into more perfect harmony with the same Greek original. At the same time it remained free from Syro-hexaplaric influence. Later, it was again corrected or revised, from mere internal evidence however, quite independently of the Greek original. Indeed, the reviser was evidently ignorant of the Greek language. This Greek original differs from any known text in the same idiom, while it betrays close kinship with

the "Vetus Latina" and must have come from the same source. More than that, the author of the "Vetus Latina" seems to have consulted the Peschitta.

It is hardly necessary to emphasize the usefulness of Dr. Holtzmann's study. The Peschitta, like most of the other important versions, counts almost as many authors as there are books in the Bible. Each Book therefore has to be studied separately. This has been done for most of the Protocanonical Books, while so far only two of the Deutero-Canonical Books have enjoyed such a privilege (Baruch and the First Book of Maccabees). We regret that the author had to use Hebrew type for the Syriac quotations. Otherwise his work is thorough and cannot be commended too highly.

HENRY HYVERNAT.

A Reply to Professor Bourne's "The Whitman Legend." By Myron Eells, D.D. Walla Walla, Wash., 1902. 12°, pp. 123.

Long before missionaries of any denomination had crossed the Rocky Mountains north of the Mexican possessions, French Canadians, and Iroquois and Nipissing, domiciled Indians of Canada, employees of the British fur companies, had imparted the elementary principles of Christianity to the tribes in the old Oregon Territory. Rev. Jason Lee founded the first mission, that of the Methodists, among the Canadians and Calapooya Indians in the Willamette Valley in 1834; Rev. Herbert Beaver and wife, who came from England by sea, founded an Anglican mission at Fort Vancouver in 1836, and Marcus Whitman, M.D., and Rev. H. H. Spalding and their wives, founded the Presbyterian missions at Waiilatpu and Lapwai, on the Upper Columbia, later in the same year. Very Rev. Francis Norbertus Blanchet founded the first Catholic missions at Fort Vancouver and Cowlitz Prairie in 1838; and Rev. Fr. P. J. De Smet, S.J., founded the Flathead mission of the Rocky Mountains in 1841.

From these missions sprang others, until November 29, 1847—two days after the establishment of the Umatilla mission by Rt. Rev. Maglorius Blanchet, Bishop of Walla Walla, and Very Rev. J. B. A. Brouillet, his vicar-general—when Dr. Whitman, catechist and teacher at the Waiilatpu mission, was inhumanly murdered by his Cayuse Indians, together with several members of his household. This event brought on Indian wars and caused the abandonment for some years of all the Upper Columbia missions.

After the rescue of Rev. Mr. Spalding from his Lapwai mission, among the Nez Perces, his mind, always unstable, gave way, and

in his degeneracy he basely charged the Catholic missionaries with inciting the Protestant Indians to the breaking up of their missions. This story was eagerly taken up by ultra-Protestant writers and served a purpose during the Know-Nothing agitation on the Pacific Coast in the middle of the last century. Feeling himself and his missionary companions to be neglected by his missionary association, Mr. Spalding in 1865, then more of an illusionist than ever, advanced the preposterous proposition that the missionaries, and Dr. Whitman in particular, had saved Oregon to the United States from the machinations of the Hudson's Bay Company and the Catholic missionaries, by his undertaking a journey to Washington in the winter of 1842, to advise the Tyler administration against trading off Oregon for a cod-fishery privilege off the coast of Maine, and to bring immigrants to settle and occupy the Oregon country. This is the basis of the "Whitman-Saved-Oregon" claim, designed to illustrate the ultimate success of the Presbyterian missions of the Upper Columbia, which as a matter of fact, were unsuccessful, from various causes, chief among which were dissensions between the missionaries themselves, and the eventual substitution of grasping commercialism to the missionary principle.

In 1871, Rev. Mr. Spalding, still deeming himself neglected, appealed to the civil authorities for employment, under the Grant "Peace Policy," through the means of his "Early Labors of the Missionaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions in Oregon, commencing in 1836," which he succeeded in having published as Senate Ex. Doc. No. 37. This is one of the most extraordinary publications that ever issued from the presses of any Government. It is a scandalous fabrication of most glaring untruths; yet it is the unavowed source of the writings of the propagators of the "Whitman-Saved-Oregon" claim, the principal of whom are the Rev. Messrs. Barrows, Eells (father and son), Craighead, and Mowry.

To their honor and credit Principal Marshall of Chicago and Professor Bourne of Yale University—the first by the collation of the entire bibliography and historical sources on the subject, the results of which he has given in newspaper articles, to be followed by a formal history, and the latter by a most scholarly essay based on Mr. Marshall's data as well as on his own intelligent original researches, have placed the question on a new basis, contradictory of the thesis expressed by "The Whitman Legend."

The pamphlet before us is an attempt to turn away the stream which is devastating the fabric of "The Oregon Myth." Like the mighty Columbia, sweeping down to the ocean, the fabrications of

man are unavailing to stem its flood. As a composition the pamphlet is scarcely above mediocrity, and as an argument it is exceedingly weak, the author apparently lacking literary training and historical acumen to cope with such an historical athlete as Professor Bourne. The principal source of his weakness, however, lies in the fact that, having in the past written too much and too confidently on the Oregon question, he is not now susceptible of being impressed by the truth; nor would he be free to admit the fact if he were convinced of the weakness of the cause he has so zealously espoused, since filial duty would make it unseemly.

EDMOND MALLET.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Oxford and Cambridge Conferences. Second Series: 1900-1901.

By Joseph Rickaby, S.J. St. Louis: B. Herder, 1902. Pp. 246.

There are very few educated Catholics, clerical or lay, for whom the reading of Father Rickaby's Conferences would not be an entertaining occupation. His talks possess so much of what is called *actualité*, that if, when first delivered, they came forth with any thing like the facility that appears on the printed page, they must have won the strictest kind of attention from his audience.

Father Rickaby is already well known to the world, both as a philosophical writer and as the author of a previous volume of conferences. The present book contains no surprises, but is what might be reasonably anticipated from the writer; that is, a work solid and instructive in matter, pointed and original in expression. Some very difficult questions are touched upon, but only for popular, not for scholarly treatment, and the impression left is a general sense of a clearing-up and illuminating process. In presenting the Catholic doctrines concerning Holy Scripture in the light of the "Providentissimus Deus," our author gives a very helpful and very attractive treatment of matters that could easily have been made to appear obscure and incomprehensible. One is tempted to quote in support of this verdict, but justice would demand too long a quotation. Let the reader consult the conference "Inspiration and Historical Accuracy of the Holy Scripture" as a sample of the author's style and as a model of a popular method of imparting instruction. As there is no attempt at profundity of research in these pages, so neither is there any attempt at sonorous phrasing; the tone is conversational in its freedom. This, however, does not prevent the book from being quite suitable for a library of apologetical literature; for it teaches much

about many things, clearly, pleasantly, and in brief compass. Like every properly prepared volume, this one has an index.

JOSEPH MCSORLEY.

ST. THOMAS COLLEGE.

Theologia Moralis Fundamentalis. Auctore Thoma Joseph Bouquillon, S.T.D., et in Universitate Catholica Americana Theologæ Moralis Professore. Editio tertia recognita et adaucta. Brugis: Beyært, 1903. Pp. 743.

This third edition of the Fundamental Theology was issuing from the press when the illustrious author died. Failing health had somewhat dulled his keenness of mind, while he was engaged in the work of revision, but he had completed his task when he was called to his reward.

The new edition is somewhat enlarged, but there are no essential changes. The introduction contains a more detailed discussion of fundamental notions, and the historical part has been perfected. It includes the most recent literature bearing on the relations of Moral Theology. The purpose of this notice, therefore, need not be other than to call attention to this splendid monument of learning and to recommend it without qualification to all clergymen and others who desire to possess a clear and comprehensive presentation of the principles of Moral Theology.

When the second edition appeared it won for its author the unstinted praise of two continents. He was declared *Summus Magister*, for he had shown a mastery of his science that was unexcelled among his contemporaries. He had given to it the elasticity, progressiveness and system which it had greatly needed. From the view-point of "literature" alone, the Fundamental is a remarkable book. The author's knowledge of the literary sources of his science was extraordinary. He skilfully drew out what was permanent and best in all preceding literature of every question which he treated; he added to that fund by his own keen insight and wide knowledge of the reasons and relations of truths, and he presented the results in his text with great clearness. Yet, his erudition never made him a pedant, nor did his skill in thinking ever convert him into a skeptic.

The place that the volume occupies in the literature of Moral Theology cannot be better described than by drawing from the lamented author's study on "Moral Theology at the End of the Nineteenth Century," in BULLETIN for April, 1899. The thought in brief is as follows.

Moral Theology deals with practical revealed truth and its relations. A gradual disintegration has robbed the science of its dignity, and it has become a mere technical necessity for the priest. Through political and religious revolutions theology had lost contact with other sciences and was driven from the universities to seminaries and sacristies. Later, Moral Theology was separated from Dogmatic Theology; then the laws of Christian perfection were taken into Ascetical Theology; those of the religious life were taken up into Liturgy, those of public life into Law. Thus reduced to the narrowest limits, and confined largely to the consideration of private life, Moral Theology was converted into a set of conclusions and applications, while the principles on which these rested were neglected. Finally, in the teaching of the science, different aspects of moral questions were treated by different professors. The science had disintegrated, it had lost its dignity, its nature was misunderstood.

The author understood this historical process thoroughly, and he made it the purpose of his life to assist in restoring the science to its proper place. His Fundamental Theology is the supreme effort of his career. The concluding words of the study to which we refer express directly the scope of his work and the spirit of its accomplishment.

"A more intimate union with the theoretical truths of revelation is necessary, so that the laws of right living may be seen to spring from the very heart of dogma. Critical study and extended research into the development of the fundamental ideas and principles of moral life and their applications, not alone in Christian times, but in Old Testament times as well, and back to the beginning of humanity, must be made. The intelligent application of these principles to the problems of modern individual, social, religious and civil life is essential to the reestablishment which we seek, as is also a more constant contact with the other social sciences from which, rightly understood, only good can come. There is reason to hope that the coming century will see this done, for the impetus has already been given in the admirable encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII."

The Fundamental is a magnificent contribution to the literature of Moral Theology. When the science shall have been reconstructed, no one can doubt that Professor Bouquillon's name will stand high among the great ones in its history.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

The Social Unrest. By J. G. Brooks. New York: Macmillan, 1903. Pp. 394.

The author of this volume is one of the best known as well as most highly appreciated students of our social conditions. He has done much of his studying in and among the events that have characterized the recent industrial life of the nation. "Social Unrest" is a fascinating volume. The author tells us with great directness and force of the results of many years of painstaking observation

The volume is full of real information about labor unions, labor leaders, socialism, employers, recent changes in socialistic thought in Europe, and it contains an accurate appreciation of some of the deeper tendencies in economic activity.

The author's personality appears on every page; the use of his own experience on which he largely draws, does not require the apology which he makes, but on the contrary enhances the value and the charm of the book.

This well-merited praise might be all that a reviewer would be required to write, did not the positive and direct way of the author tend somewhat to mislead readers. That trait of the volume may be referred to without diminishing in any way, we hope, the welcome which the book merits and is undoubtedly destined to receive.

The introductory chapter conveys the impression that books are either misleading or largely useless in the study of social questions. "It was several years before I learned that for one branch of economic study, the live questions like strikes, trade unions, the influence of machinery, very few books existed that had more than a slight value." The author undoubtedly implies that books rightly made—as his own—are useful, while books published by mere theorizers are of little use. There are, of course, useless books, but it would seem that there is some danger of misleading when one makes a statement so broad. The right use of books might save many men from becoming extreme reformers, and right training of writers and thinkers should enable us to learn how to use and how not to use books: how to examine and how not to examine life independently of books. "Social Unrest" is a creditable combination of the right use and right avoidance of books. The author has studied them well, and used them, in fact, throughout his work with good effect. Yet his main emphasis is on events, men and forces as they actually shape life.

Mr. Brooks calls attention to his discovery, "inexcusably late," to use his words, that "most men do not put their deepest opinions into print, or state them before the public." His aim was to find

out those deeper opinions and present them as supplementary evidence in his social study.

It is well known that men who deal with vital questions, with problems which deeply concern public welfare, do not and can not always put their deeper opinions into print. It is well that they do not. The legitimate stability of the social order, public or industrial position, natural fallibility of human judgment and the prospect that to-morrow's knowledge may change to-day's views, are all elements which tend to deter full frank, general expression of deeper opinion. Extreme reformers always express their most advanced thought; as a result we have no patience with them. Had Ruskin said only half of what he felt about life and its problems, he would undoubtedly have accomplished much more for the ideals that he loved so intensely. We must ask that men be entirely honest as far as they do express opinions; but it seems dangerous to encourage leaders to go farther in their public teaching than the institutions and temper of their time can safely allow. Naturally dishonest teaching is to be reprobated, but prudent reserve and legitimate caution must be exercised in our teaching when times are as troubled as they now are.

It is not impossible that the author's frankness itself leads one to misunderstand him when he makes the observations referred to. Leaving them aside, as secondary, one must give the author of "Social Unrest" credit for having written a most instructive book. In having included such a great variety of topics, he denied to himself the opportunity of far-reaching analysis and classification. Yet as a book full of instruction, revealing much sympathy with life and its problems, written at the cost of great personal effort and possibly the sacrifice of comfort, "Social Unrest" merits well of the public. It can be highly recommended to students of the Social Question.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

Le Compagnonnage. Par E. Martin Saint-Léon. Paris: Colin. 1902. Pp. xxviii + 374.

This volume contains a study of the origin, development and present condition of that form of labor union known in French as Le Compagnonnage—corresponding to the stage in craft instruction which in the Middle Ages preceded mastership.

The work is one of many due to the revival of interest in mediæval labor. In a charming narrative and concrete style, the author tells us the fascinating story of a very important branch of mediæval organization; a combination of faith, religion, industry, mystery and

good-fellowship, which we scarcely find to-day in our civilization, not even in the remnants of the organization itself.

The author shows scholarly caution where his sources are doubtful, and a good historical sense in his manner of presentation. The reader may be interested in the main thought of the work which we briefly indicate. In so doing we invert the order followed by the author in his exposition.

The Middle Ages reveals organization everywhere; in France the *corporations* and in Germany the *guilds* were of course unions of laborers or artisans. The confraternities were religious organizations which united the laboring men as Christians and pledged them to benevolent work in the interest of one another; the itinerant wholesale merchants had their organizations, and later even the free masons appeared as a form of organized labor.

The Corporations in France included three divisions of artisans: *apprentis, valets, maitres*. In earlier days the apprentice might become master directly, but in the fourteenth century the intermediate stage appears permanently. The term *compagnon* replaced *valet* and it remains in use to-day.

The Companions were therefore logically on the way to mastership, but about the fourteenth century this latter distinction was earned with great difficulty. One was forced to remain companion for four or five years, or was forced to travel from village to village to complete one's education. The production of the masterpiece was difficult and costly, and the whim of the judges determined whether or not one succeeded. Many laborers were too poor, many too lazy, many too dull to advance beyond that condition. There they remained during life. They were thus a distinct class; distinct in intelligence, methods, social standing, and in the fact that they were forced to travel. Naturally a class sense arose, and that was followed by organization. Their purpose being self-protection and their interests being distinct from those of the corporations, they naturally drifted into secrecy; thus the association became a secret society, into which initiation was attended by deep mystery and sworn pledges of secrecy. The organization spread pretty generally over France, and some remnants of it remain to-day. Elaborate ceremony marked every function. Their members were baptized and named. They were at home wherever they went in making the *tour de France*. They found in every village a lodging place, whose proprietor was affiliated to the organization.

The records show that the association was based largely on a religious sentiment, that it exercised originally a strong moral influ-

not
ful,
The
we
the

the
s of
ions
a to
ole-
sons

ans:
be-
iate
and

ter-
was
nion
village
was
ther
azy,
re-
s in
were
ew
in-
ally
into
s of
and
ked
hey
nce.
was

re-
flu-

ence over its members. The clergy appeared to have been sympathetic with it, though it was condemned by the Sorbonne in 1655 for secrecy, profanation of God's name, derision of religion, diabolical traditions, etc.

The origin of the association is obscure. Levasseur, in his history of the French laboring classes, doubts any records earlier than the fourteenth century. Though our author finds nothing certain before the fifteenth century, he is inclined to think that the association dates from the late twelfth century. In its best days it was divided into three great branches. Its power waned rapidly towards the eighteenth century, though there are some vigorous remnants of the association in Francee. The author exposes the present condition of the society with considerable detail.

The work is extremely interesting and valuable on account of the numerous sources to which reference is constantly made, and because of the concrete and lucid manner of exposition followed. The study is a companion to the author's larger work, *Histoire des Corporations de Métiers*, which appeared in 1897. His last work is on Trusts, the volume having just appeared in the *Bibliothèque d'Economie Sociale* of Paris.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

The Girlhood of Our Lady. By Marion J. Brunowe. New York: The Cathedral Library Association.

There is material for a score of delicate poems in Miss Brunowe's handsome little volume. She has connected in a series of short chapters many of the prettiest legends of the early life of Mary, and in the rendering from the ancient stories she has managed to keep the delicious savor of piety that permeates the original legends. Here and there the authoress has thrown in some topological description and an occasional bit of actual Oriental custom. They give a tinge of reality to the devout imaginings of the traditions. There is also an abundance of delightful pictures, some of them reproductions of the old masters, others of the modern German pietistic painters, all of them as soothing to the eye as the text is pleasing to the imagination.

JAMES C. GILLIS.

Hermeneutica Biblica Generalis secundum principia catholica. Scriptis Dr. Stephanus Szikely, professor p.o. studii biblici N. T. in reg. Hung. scientiarum universitate Budapestensi. Friburgi, Brisgoviae: Herder, 1902. 8°, pp. iv + 446.

This work deserves a prominent place in the list of excellent treatises on Biblical Hermeneutics. The book is intended for use in

seminaries and also as a handbook for more profound study. A larger type distinguishes the principal theses with their necessary explanations from the more profuse discussions. This well adapts the book for its two fold purpose.

The prolegomena contain the definition, division, necessity, sources, and history of hermeneutics. The reader will find the pages on the history of biblical hermeneutics especially attractive. They show the gradual development of the science and give an excellent bibliography. Throughout the work the author has not neglected to give the principal authorities under the various chapters, which adds much to the value of the book.

The treatise proper is divided into three parts: the first considers the sense (*theoria sensus, hematica*); the second discovery of the sense (*investigatio sensus, heuristica*); the third, the exposition of the sense (*propositio sensus, prophoristica*).

The author gives almost twenty-five pages to the first part. His definitions are clear, easily understood and generally very exact. The importance of a firm grasp of the difference between the verbal and real sense and between the symbolical and typical justly lead us to wish for a longer discussion.

The greater part of the book is taken up with the discovery of the sense. The author follows the most logical plan, treating in order the rational interpretation, Christian interpretation, and Catholic interpretation. The Bible is indeed a Divine book, but the words expressing the thoughts are human, and the manner of expression is modified by circumstances of time and place, by the condition of the persons for whom the sacred books were primarily written and by the subjective dispositions and qualifications of the writers. Dr. Szikely therefore speaks of the logical, rhetorical and psychologico-historical sense. In condensed form he gives a good idea of the rhetoric of the sacred writings, of the character of the biblical poetry, and the peculiarities in the language of the Bible.

A discussion of the nature, possibility, necessity and extent of inspiration serves as an introduction to the pages explaining the laws of Christian interpretation. The distinction of inspiration into positive and negative is not very happily chosen nor very clear. Positive inspiration, says the learned author, required, first, motionem ad scriendum, second, influxum positivum in intellectum, scilicet intimationem notionum novarum, and third, directionem voluntatis. In negative inspiration the first and third of these acts are the same as in the positive, but the positivus influxus in intellectum is absent, and in place of it we have impeditio meram erroris. The

distinction can be easily understood. Dr. Szikely very properly considers the systems of the Jews and rationalists as opposed to the laws of Christian interpretation. Though rationalists are one in eliminating from the Bible all that is supernatural, the methods they follow to attain this end are many and various. The author describes their systems in a very interesting manner.

The laws for interpreting Scripture are modified by the rule of faith and therefore the laws of Catholic interpretation must be opposed to the Protestant systems where the Bible alone is recognized as a guide. The author closes this second part with a very useful article on the attitude of the Church in regard to the reading of Sacred Scripture.

The history of biblical exegesis is very instructive. The author details the progress of exegesis among the Jews. Christian exegesis began with Christ, was carried on by the apostles and early writers, flourished especially in the schools of Alexandria and Antioch, and among the Latin Fathers. Dr. Szikely then traces the development during the Middle Ages, continuing the list of Catholic exegetes down to our own time, and mentioning in a separate paragraph the principal Protestant interpreters. Dr. Szikely has given us an admirable book, written in pure, simple, correct language, a book that will be appreciated by every student.

JOHN G. SCHMIDT.

Der Schöpfungsbericht Der Genesis, mit Berücksichtigung der neuesten Entdeckungen und Forschungen erklärt von Fr. Vine. Zapletal, O.P., Ord. Professor der alttest. Exegese an der Universität Fribourg (Schweiz). Fribourg: B. Veith, 1902. 8°, pp. vi + 104.

The author well compares the literature on the first chapter of Genesis to a great pyramid. Many books have been written on the scriptural account of creation and we suspect that many more will be written before the problem is finally and satisfactorily solved. Fr. Zapletal's work should be welcomed as a scientific contribution. He shows a thorough acquaintance with the latest writers and newest discoveries. He leaves aside questions no longer of interest and discusses the controversies of the present.

In the first chapter the author justifies the assumption that Genesis I, 1-II, 3, is a complete and independent record. The second account is so different in form and order, that the two cannot be traced to the same source of information. Genesis II, 4, is not a conclusion of the first account, nor is it the title to what follows, but is a later addition.

In the second chapter the author examines the text critically and exegetically. The treatise is brief but thorough, with constant reference to the best and latest writers. The discussion of the word "Bara" is very interesting. The reasons for and against the meaning, *creatio prima ex nihilo*, are clearly stated. The Hebrews were influenced by the views of the neighboring people. Their cosmogony cannot be fully understood without a knowledge of the theories current among other nations. The Egyptian, Phoenician and Babylonian cosmogonies are discussed in the third chapter.

Fr. Zapletal next reviews the various explanations of the account of Genesis that have hitherto been given. He classifies the various theories under the literal, ideal, periodistic or mythical interpretation. The author draws the following conclusion: All the systems contain partial truth, but none gives a complete solution. The literal theory justly insists that the writers of this chapter uses the word "day" in its natural meaning; the ideal explanation is not wrong in asserting that the order of the works of creation is not necessarily historical; mythicism is not mistaken in finding words from Oriental mythologies in Genesis; the periodistic theory is right in contending that creation did not take place in six natural days but extends over various periods. But because each system contains truth in part only, a final solution must be sought elsewhere. We need a system that will combine and harmonize the truths already established and will give a satisfactory answer to difficulties still remaining.

Fr. Zapletal's explanation of the biblical account of creation is: the author wished to teach his readers that the world was created by God without the assistance of any intermediary Demiurge; that the world is anthropocentric; that the Sabbath must be kept as a day of rest. The account is apologetic in character. The neighboring people adored the sun, moon, and stars; worshipped animals, plants, and other creatures. The Israelites are here told that all these have been brought into existence by the word Elohim. To be clear and pointed, the author had to adapt his language to the time and people, take into consideration their views. He offered a plan of creation which could be understood easily and which might serve as a substitute for the current heathen cosmogonies. The writer can speak of light on the first day and of the sun on the fourth because the popular mind considered light independent from the sun.

What was the scheme of creation as intended by the writer of Genesis? Fr. Zapletal finds the key for its solution in Gen. II, 1. The scholastics speak of "opus distinctionis et opus ornatus." They depended on the Latin translation: *Igitur perfecti sunt coeli et terra*

et omnis ornatus eorum. This must be corrected to read "exercitus eorum." The two ternaries are "productio regionum et productio exercituum." This explains why the plants are mentioned on the third day. Without the plants the earth would not have been prepared to receive the army which was to inhabit it. In the last chapter the author treats of the literary and historical characters of this account.

JOHN G. SCHMIDT.

De Libri Baruch Vetustissima Latina Versione usque adhuc inedita in celeberrimo Codice Cavensi, Epistola Ambrosii M. Amelli Archivarii Casinensis ad Antonium M. Ceriani Praefectum Bibliothecæ Ambrosianæ. Typis Archicœnobii Montis Casini, 1902. 8°, pp. 15.

The untiring efforts of the Benedictines and of Don Ambrogio Amelli, the scholarly archivist of Monte Casino, are again manifested in this study of the Book of Baruch. These pages offer a specimen from a recension heretofore unedited and supposed by scholars of repute to be one of the oldest versions of Baruch, found in the famous Cavensis Codex. This Codex was written in Spain in Visigothic characters, by Danila, and is preserved at present in the Benedictine Abbey of Corpi di Cava, near Salerno. Such scholars as Wordsworth, Berger, Zeigler, Coorsen and others favor the antiquity of this Codex, but there is no agreement as to its date. Cardinal Mai places it between the seventh and eighth centuries, though others put it as late as the tenth century.

Don Amelli, after a thorough critical study of it, in the light of other Visigothic codices preserved at Monte Casino, is of the opinion that its date is not earlier than the ninth century. The specimen of this version of the Book of Baruch is taken from the third chapter, verses twenty-four to thirty-seven. In this small portion, Amelli notes some remarkable likenesses between the Codex Cavensis and Sabatier's edition of the Vulgate (V), the Codex Casinensis (C), and the text of the Ambrosian Missal (A). From the concordance between these Books and their slight differences Don Amelli concludes: (1) Texts A. C. V. depend upon the Codex Cavensis as on a common archetype, so they are three recensions of one and the same version. (2) Codex Cavensis agrees with A and C more than with V; thus A and C rather constitute one text and are one recension.

Don Amelli believes that this version of the book of Baruch came into use before 347 A. D. From the wording of the version it is easily

proved that the "Epistola" attached to the book of Baruch was really from the "Vetus," while the Liber belonged to that Vulgate which Jerome has styled "Communis," because in common ecclesiastical use from the remotest times. The graecisms of the version and its latinity betray the plebeian language, so much disliked after the days of Damasus and Jerome. In Codex Cavensis, "plebs" appears not infrequently; but the new Vulgate substitutes "populus."

Another interesting feature of the Codex is the marginal annotation. In the margin of Micheas V, 2 is written in purely Visigothic characters: "In LXX habet: domus Ephrata modicus es ut sis in milibus Iude." Jerome in his commentary on Micheas has "et tu Bethleem domus Ephrata nequaquam minima es ut sis in millibus Iuda." But in the Vulgate we read: Et tu Bethleem domus Ephrata modicus es ut sis in milibus Juda.

Probably the author of these notes was some pious monk, as seems evident from the following allusions to the question of predestination. In the margin of Acts XV, 18, we find: "Audiant hoc testimonium qui predestinationem, non ex præscientia sicuti est, sed proposito et voluntate divina dicunt esse decretam." Acts XV, 20, "Audiant hæc qui pene homnia quæ venatione capiuntur suffocatum mandueant." The date of this annotator may have been from A. D. 848 to 855, for in Gaul about that time, the question of predestination was being much discussed. In fact three councils, at Mayence in 848, at Quiersy in 849, and at Valence in 855, were held against the monk Gottschalk who died for his opinions on this mystery.

The study of Don Ameli, so recently honored by an appointment to the Biblical Commission, is of value not only to the student of Sacred Scripture, but also to the philologist, and is a new proof of the genuine interest which the Benedictines have ever kept up in all that pertains to ancient ecclesiastical literature.

HENRY I. STARK.

Histoire des Livres du Nouveau Testament. Par E. Jacquier.

Tome I. Lecoffre, 1903. Pp. xi + 488.

This is one of many volumes forming, when united, the "Bibliothèque de l'Enseignement de l'Histoire Ecclésiastique," an enterprise for which the great publishing house of Lecoffre has assumed the responsibility. When completed, it promises to give to readers of the laity and of the clergy an excellent series of manuals on the origin and on the development of the Christian religion.

The present volume deals with the life and writings of the Apostle Paul. It will be followed by other volumes on the Gospels, on the

Acts, on the Catholic Epistles, and on the Apocalypse. The first two chapters of the volume deal with such preliminary questions as the chronology and the language of the New Testament. The author places the birth of our Lord in the third or fourth year before the Christian era, the beginning of his public life in the twenty-sixth or in the twenty-eighth year, and the Crucifixion in the twenty-ninth or thirtieth year of the Christian era. According to this calculation our Lord was about thirty-three years of age at the time of his death. St. Paul was converted to Christianity about the year A. D. 34, that is to say, about four or five years after the Ascension. His apostolic journeys began about A. D. 44 and continued to A. D. 60-62. His martyrdom took place at Rome in A. D. 67. Our author places, as is generally done, the Epistles to the Thessalonians first in order of time among the writings of the Apostles. They were written towards the close of the year 52, and during the early part of Paul's residence at Corinth. The Epistle to the Hebrews is the last in the order of time. The composition of this splendid Epistle M. Jacquier does not ascribe in very positive terms to the Apostle.

Considering the number and the variety of the subjects discussed, we have no hesitation in affirming that this is one of the most thorough and independent investigations of New Testament history that has appeared among Catholics for some time.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

The Mystery of Sleep. By John Bigelow, LL.D. Second Edition.
New York: Harper and Brothers, 1903. 8°, pp. xiii + 215.

This is not a technical, psychological study of sleep phenomena, but an attempt to determine the value of sleep as a recuperative process for the upbuilding of the spiritual, as opposed to the sensible life. The author discusses in a popular way the problem why we spend one third of our lives in an unconscious state. He endeavors to dispel some popular delusions that sleep is merely a state of rest, of practical inertia of body and soul, or at most a periodical provision for the reparation of physical waste. Sleep dissociates us from the world in which we live, interrupts all conscious relations with the phenomenal world and thus becomes one of the vital processes of spiritual regeneration. Our moral side has been free, secluded from all the distractions of the world, and thus affords our spirit help to a direct, prolonged and undisturbed communion with God. Sleep helps our moral growth, thus infants sleep longer than adults. Fatigue does not create a need for repose, for if so, argues Mr. Bigelow, why should the octogenarian trembling with weakness sleep less?

Fatigue in its nature, the author does not discuss. Then the desire and the necessity for sleep should be regarded as a providential arrangement to induce us to cultivate the virtues most favorable to its enjoyment, just as hunger and thirst are the agents of Providence for teaching us to be frugal, industrious, and temperate, that they may be reasonably gratified.

HENRY I. STARK.

Sermons and Discourses. Vol. II. By Rev. John McQuirk, D.D., LL.D. New York: St. Paul's Library, 1903. 8°.

This volume is published with the view of contributing to the restoration of family reading, a custom once quite prevalent and productive of much fruit, but now almost obsolete. There can be no doubt that the success of the preacher depends upon a clearly recognized and acted-upon duty on the part of the faithful to profit by his preaching. So the author gives a volume of sermons which are well done, very readable, replete with good thought, plain, pleasant and persuasive. The sermons on the Real Presence, Christian Charity, Infallibility, the Holy Ghost, are especially worthy of attention for the solidity of their expression and the soundness of their theology. The volume is well deserving of the perusal of the clergy and laity alike; we hope it will contribute to the restoration of the beautiful and Christian custom of family-reading.

HENRY I. STARK.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- A Little Chaplet for the Queen of Angels, or A Short Meditation for every evening in May. By Rev. B. J. Raycroft, M.A. New York: Pustet, 1903. 8°, pp. 137.
- Wreaths of Song from a Course of Divinity. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son, 1903. 8°, pp. 80.
- The Sheriff of Beach Fork, a Story of Kentucky. By Henry S. Spalding, S.J. New York: Benziger, 1903. 8°, pp. 223.
- Nothing New, A few words of hope and Confidence, etc. By Rev. Patrick J. Murphy. New York: H. C. Clinton, 413 W. 59th St., 1903. 12°, pp. 64.
- The Our Father analyzed according to the doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas. By Rev. J. G. Hogan, S.J., translated from the German by a Visitation Nun, Georgetown, D. C. New York: Benziger, 1903. 12°, pp. 22.
- The Holy Family Series of Catholic Catechisms, No. 2. By Rev. Francis J. Butler, Priest of the Archdiocese of Boston. Boston: Thomas J. Flynn & Co., 1903. 8°, pp. 249 + 62.

NOTES AND COMMENT.

History of Education.—Father Magevney's articles on the history of modern education will repay the reader. Their original shape as review articles compelled, perhaps, the rather crowded presentation of his materials. There is, occasionally, something of a declamatory tone that detracts from the solid merit of these outlines of a long and interesting development. In a future edition it might be well to add in a separate bibliography the full titles of all the educational works described or used. Le Bee in Normandy (viii, 6) usually reads the Abbey of Bee. In the same number (p. 10) is it not unjust to say of Luther that his temperament was "unaesthetic"? His devotion to music is well known, and his lovely "Frau Musica" is one of the choicest gems of praise that were ever bestowed upon this art. Dr. Baeumker, a Catholic historian of Church music, calls him "ein feiner Kunstkennner, ein grosser Freund und Liebhaber der Musik," in genuine intelligent sympathy with such masters as Josquin de Prés (*Zur Geschichte der Tonkunst*, Freiburg, 1881, p. 153). Given the scarcity of Catholic literature in English on all that pertains to the history, principles and methods of modern education, these brochures of Fr. Magevney are both welcome and useful. (*The Reformation and Education, 1520-1648; Systems and Counter-Systems of Education, 1648-1800*, Nos. 8 and 9 of the Pedagogical Truth Library, published by the Cathedral Library Association, New York, 1903, 8°, pp. 56 and 53).

Some New Works of Edification.—In "The Gift of Pentecost" Fr. Meschler offers us a volume of theological considerations on the office and function of the Holy Spirit in the theology and constitution, sacraments and daily life, aspirations and ideals of the Catholic Church. The translation is correct and idiomatic, and there is room for such a work even after the classical text of Cardinal Manning. ("The Gifts of Pentecost," *Meditations on the Holy Ghost*, by M. Meschler, S.J., translated from the German by Lady Amabel Kerr, St. Louis, Herder, 1903, 8°, pp. xi + 498, \$1.60.) Fr. Girardey offers us an English edition of certain ascetical considerations compiled from the writings of the Jesuit theologian, Fr. Schneider. To them he has added other thoughts and reflexions drawn from the works of Saint Alphonsus. The little book recommends itself to

those whose estate calls them to the higher Christian life, and to others whom the Holy Spirit calls along that mystic path. ("Helps to a Spiritual Life," from the German of Joseph Schneider, S.J., with additions by Rev. Ferreol Girardey, C.S.S.R., New York, Benziger, 1903, 8°, pp. vi + 257, \$1.25.) It is long since we have read a devotional book so admirable for content and temper as this volume of Fr. Clifford. In form and style it leaves little to be desired. Nothing in our literature of piety corresponds to this sanely religious piece of exegesis of the opening lines of each Sunday's liturgy. It is Prayer Book and Homily combined. Throughout, its thought is elevated dignified, healthy, and appeals to every sincere Christian as the expression of genuine religion, removed at once from the insipidity of some books of piety and from the adiaphorous or intangible exhortations of others. In the commentary of Fr. Clifford we seem to note a serenity, "sweet reasonableness" and gentle piquancy, such as the troubled modern mind may easily admire, and admiring follow in the paths indicated. ("Introibo," a series of detached readings of the Entrance Versicles of the Ecclesiastical Year, by Rev. Cornelius Clifford, Cathedral Library Association, 534 Amsterdam Ave., New York, 1903, 8°, pp. 304.)

Religion and the Religious Sense.—Is religion worth studying as a great fact of modern life? Is it something visible, measurable, something quite on a level with all the objects of personal and social psychology? Is the religious sense itself something native in man, imperishable, useful? Can we answer these questions, not only from the materials of revelation and tradition, but with the aid of the methods and the conclusions of modern science? To these questions the Abbé Klein, professor in the Institut Catholique of Paris, replies in a very suggestive volume made up of discourses delivered in the Cours Supérieur for young ladies (1897-1901) and in the church of the Sorbonne (1902). The book abounds in luminous *aperçus*, there are breadth and clearness in his vision of the large province of fact that he outlines, and the method that he advocates is based at once on the sanest traditions of Catholic theology and the undeniable advances of modern science. As introductory to a greater work on "Dogma and Apologetics" these pages of the distinguished professor of Paris are replete with good sense and moderation, both of claim and style. The Abbé Klein is well known in France as a translator of American Catholic works and as a genial and sympathetic friend of our country and our institutions. ("Le Fait Religieux et la manière de l'observer," Paris, Lethielleux, 8°, 1903, pp. 212.)

Spiritual Marriage in the Primitive Church.—Dr. Hans Achelis, well and favorably known for his edition of the Canons of Hippolytus, contributes an interesting chapter to the story of platonie love in Roman antiquity. He has collected all the references in primitive ecclesiastical history to the “*Virgines Subintroductæ*,” a peculiar custom or abuse soundly denounced by Saint Cyprian as early as the middle of the third century. According to Dr. Achelis, who follows a hint of Mosheim, this custom vigorously and rightfully rooted out by the bishops of that time, was in reality only a long-enduring reminiscence of the earliest Christian times when such unions were solely spiritual. Intensity of religious enthusiasm, clear vision of the nearness of Christ’s second coming, heroic renunciation of life itself, let alone its pleasures, certain peculiarities of the antique temperament, go far to explain the persistency of these relations, which certain historians only too easily describe as a sheer abuse and a sign of early degeneracy of Christian morality. The study of Dr. Achelis is one of extreme interest for its content, and of equal utility for its fulness and its good method. (“*Virgines Subintroductæ*,” Ein Beitrag zu I Cor. vii, Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1902, Marks 2.80.)

A General History of Modern Commerce.—Modern history needs more and more to be studied from the view-point of economico-social movements and progress. It is to this conviction that we owe the many excellent histories of commerce that have seen the light in the last twenty years. Their solid and varied erudition needs to be recast for ordinary readers, likewise the numberless special researches in the history of commerce need to have their conclusions enumerated in some reliable manual. Dr. Webster has done this with great success, and we can recommend his summary of the history of commerce as resting on reliable and exhaustive works. Such a conspectus is of incalculable service to all teachers of history, since it appeals to the spirit the training and the tastes of the majority of our modern states. Dr. Webster uses rather strong language when he says (p. 37) that the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries encouraged brilliant services and festivals to “pamper the fancies of masses of ignorant and rude communicants” and to hold them in subjection. This is the view of a narrow iconoclastic school, and not at all justified by a liberal consideration of the development and preservation of the fine arts by great ecclesiastics from Saint Ambrose to Nicetius of Trier. Moreover, his summary (p. 97) of the merits and demerits of the Church with regard to mediæval commerce does not seem to us fair or complete. He does not count in the incalculable service

of the Church as a consumer and a producer in the Middle Ages, nor the fact that most fairs were held in the vicinity of churches and cathedrals, on the occasion of patron days, nor the decrees of councils in favor of merchants, nor the fact that such trading centres as Venice, the Hanseatic cities, Bruges, were highly religious centres at the same time. We think these pages altogether unsatisfactory and misleading, tainted with old-time Protestant prejudice, and the weakest in an otherwise very good book. ("A General History of Commerce," by William Clarence Webster, Ph.D., Boston, Ginn and Co., 1903, 8°, pp. 526.)

The Early History of Oxford and Cambridge.—We have read with equal pleasure and profit the doctorate dissertation of Mr. James F. Willard on the influence which the royal authority exercised in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries over the growth of the two sister universities of England. In the definition of membership, in the confirmation and extension of the authority of the chancellor, in the granting of protection against the local civil authorities or "borough," and later of a substantial privileged position in all matters of mixed character, the English kings so cherished these twin seats of learning that by the end of the fourteenth century they had grown from bodies of students held together by a loose code of professional customs or etiquette to a position of almost complete theoretical independence of the local and royal authorities. The clerical chancellors of the sees of Lincoln and Ely had become self-controlling heads of universities formed out of the episcopal schools; the archdeacons' power had waned completely, and in the "borough" each university had gradually secured a dominating influence in all legislation and institution affecting its students. We could have wished that the original ecclesiastical character of the chancellor had been more clearly set forth, also that the numerous positive papal enactments in favor of the universities had been gathered from Bliss' "Calendar of Papal Registers 1198-1362," and worked into a distinct chapter. This step would tend to offset the action of the papacy by that of the national authority and would thereby bring out more clearly the exact limits of the royal action on the development of mediæval Oxford and Cambridge. ("The Royal Authority and the Early English Universities," by James J. Willard, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania 1902, 8°, pp. 89.)

Christianity and the Civil Law of Rome.—Among the half forgotten classics of the nineteenth century, one might reckon the work

of M. Troplong entitled "De l'influence du Christianisme sur le droit civil des Romains" published first in 1843. The Abbé Bayle, of the diocese of Tours, gives us the latest edition of this indispensable study of the process by which the gradually infiltrating Christian spirit saturated at last the old civil law of Rome. The task was slow and painful, accompanied with many a cessation and reaction—but in the end the gentle charity of Christ affected profoundly that archaic law once so stern and heartless toward slaves, women, and children, so unfeelingly consistent in its application of an artificial family system. The doctrine of M. Troplong is that of one of the most distinguished of modern French jurisconsults, and his erudition is everywhere "de bon aloi." The sixty-one commentaries of M. Bayle are at once brief and pithy, abounding in good citations that are always apropos and helpful. The book is of much value to every student of Roman law as well as to students of the history of canon law and ecclesiastical institutions. ("De l'influence du Christianisme sur le droit civil des Romains, Nouvelle édition commentée aux points de vue philosophique, juridique et théologique de tous les temps," par M. l'Abbé Bayle, Tours, Cattier, 1902, 8°, pp. viii + 259.)

Mediæval Marian Hymns and Canticles.—Out of the forgotten musical lore of the Middle Ages Dom Pothier makes known fifty-six beautiful antiphons, proses, hymns, sequences "rhythmi" and canticles, all dealing with the Blessed Virgin, and all, more or less, in the original text. It is a bit of artistic no less than palæographic work. The simple gravity of this music recalls the Romance basilica while its delicacy and sweetness remind one of the sculptured Gothic capital. After the "Analecta Liturgica" of Fr. Dreves, there seems to be yet more than one sheaf to be gathered. These texts offer often a profound theology, apt uses of Holy Scripture, archaic simplicity of diction, with a free and original inspiration. Dom Pothier says of them rightly that they are "egregia pietatis avitæ monumenta," and compares them picturesquely with the dried flowers that the botanist's herbarium has preserved. ("Cantus Mariales quos e fontibus antiquis eruit aut opere novo veterum instar concinnavit D. Josephus Pothier abbas sancti Wandregisili, O.S.B.," Paris, Lethielleux, 1903, 8°, pp. 147.)

M. Amédée Gastoué contributes to the same good cause of Church music, at once traditional and scientific, a little volume that will please all lovers of the mediæval plain chant. It offers a transcription into modern musical terminology of a number of mediæval musical texts whose antiquated neumatic notation can now be read

by few. Without any sacrifice of palæographic-historical accuracy M. Gastoué succeeds in placing before all with photographic exactness specimens of the liturgical chant of the ninth century and later. It is the mediaeval music of the ordinary of the mass, the Kyriale, the Missa pro defunctis, vespers, burial service, confirmation, the toni psalmorum, litanies, Via Crucis, Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, and the like. ("Les principaux chants liturgiques du chœur et des fidèles, etc., Plain-Chant Grégorien traditionnel d'après les manuscrits," par Amédée Gastoué, Paris, Poussielgue, pp. 200, 1903.)

The Tribes of Latium.—We could not recommend to teachers and students of Latin in the higher classes a more useful and entertaining work than that of the Abbé Dedouvres on the Latin life and character as betrayed in their literature. We have here the substance of Roman literature in as far as it is a popular product, with a point of view that may lay claim to novelty at least in statement. The Latin was eminently a man of the fields and the market place, and his language dealt originally with cows and oxen, beans and peas and fodder, trees and hedges, the plough and the yoke, the furrow and the ditch. He is no poet, no philosopher, by nature, and though eventually he acquires an intellectual realm of poetry, philosophy and drama, he is always less at home in those borrowed habiliments than he is in his law-courts and his fortified camps. This book is well suited to help the youthful scholar to comprehend, in the original sources, the vast difference between the folk-genius of the Latin and the Hellenic. ("Les Latins peints par eux-mêmes," Paris, Picard, 1903, 8°, pp. 450.)

An Excellent Modern Work on Divorce.—The second enlarged edition of the book of Dr. Lorenzo Michaelangelo Billia on divorce, first published in 1893, is deserving of perusal by all who are interested in the sanctity of the Christian family. It contains many apt considerations, theological, philosophical and historical; the latter are particularly useful. In a series of pertinent notes he adduces the opinions of many prominent scholars and statesmen of the nineteenth century against the growing evil of divorce. The work has actually a very special value since the Italian state threatens to adopt a divorce legislation and thereby to offend the consciences of the majority of the people of the peninsula. ("Difendiamo la famiglia, saggio contro il divorzio e specialmente contro la proposta di introdurlo in Italia," Torina, Nuovo Risorgimento, 1902, 8°, pp. 275.)

The Denial of Ecclesiastical Burial in Antiquity.—Professor von Thümmel of Jena bases his description of modern Lutheran discipline in the matter of denial of ecclesiastical burial on a lengthy historical study of the same. With patience he has collected all that seems referable to that subject out of the early ecclesiastical annals, the documents of the Middle Ages, and the history of the Church down to our own time. The historical facts are of more than ordinary interest when mustered in orderly array. The brochure will have a permanent value to historians of ecclesiastical discipline, even if the standpoint of Professor Thümmel be the partisan confessional one. (“Die Versagung der kirchlichen Bestattungsfeier, ihre geschichtliche Entwicklung und gegenwärtige Bedeutung, Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1902, 8°, pp. 196, Marks 2.80.)

The Katipunan and the Filipino Commune.—The principles and methods of Filipino Freemasonry, or what passes for it, are explained in this pamphlet of 283 pages. The reader may make therein acquaintance with the marvelous charm that secret societies exercise over the Oriental mind, and the grave danger they constitute for the ordinary civil authority whenever it is distasteful to them. The actual perils of the neighboring Chinese state are an instructive comment on the tenacity and efficiency of these subterraneous organizations. It is a pity that this work of reference should be provided with neither table of contents nor alphabetical index. (The Katipunan, or the Rise and Fall of the Filipino Commune, Boston, T. J. Flynn and Co., 1903, 3d ed., pp. 283.)

Portraits of Julius Cæsar.—Mr. Frank J. Scott has added a valuable chapter to the classic “Roemische Ikonographie” of Bernouilli by the publication of some thirty-six marble heads, profiles, statues, coins, casts, busts, masks and statuettes that purport to represent the figure and features of the “foremost man of all the world.” The illustrations are accompanied by an erudite and critical text that lends especial value to this work. (Portraits of Julius Cæsar, Longmans, New York, 8°, pp. 182.)

The New Dioceses in Cuba.—We owe to the courtesy of Archbishop Chapelle, Apostolic Delegate to Cuba and Porto Rico, a copy of the Papal Brief, “Actum Praeclare” by which two new dioceses, Pinar del Rio and Cienfuegos, have been established in the island, also three parishes cut off from Havana and added to the archdiocese of Santiago. Photographs of the new cathedrals and an ecclesiastical map of Cuba accompany the valuable document.

INSTALLATION OF THE NEW RECTOR.

The Rt. Rev. Denis Joseph O'Connell, M.A., D.D., was installed as third Rector of the Catholic University of America on Wednesday, April 23, by His Eminence the Chancellor in presence of the Board of Trustees assembled for their Annual Meeting.

Mgr. O'Connell is a native of South Carolina. He was educated in the public schools and at St. Mary's College, Columbia, S. C., whence he entered Saint Charles' College in Maryland in 1868. He graduated therefrom in 1871 and in the same year began the study of philosophy and theology at Rome, as a student of the American College. He spent five years in these studies and in June, 1877, was ordained a priest. In July of the same year he was declared Doctor of Theology after a public examination which won for him the unanimous vote of his professors. In August, 1877, he returned to his diocese of Richmond, but was shortly afterward, in September of the same year, sent to Rome as the postulator for the pallium for Cardinal Gibbons, recently made Archbishop of Baltimore. In February, 1878, he returned to the United States and for several years had charge of various missions along the James River in Virginia. As pastor of Winchester he dedicated in 1883 the Church built at Front Royal through the generosity of the Jenkins family of Baltimore.

In October, 1883, he was sent to Rome to prepare for the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. He returned in January, 1884, and was constantly employed during the following months in the preparation of the Council, its promulgation, the extensive correspondence that followed, and in preparing at Saint Charles College, in company with the distinguished theologians of the Council, the decrees of the same. In the Council itself he was one of the four principal secretaries, the others being Mgr. Corcoran, Dr. Messmer and Dr. Gabrieles—the latter two are now respectively bishops of Green Bay and Ogdensburg. In March, 1885, Mgr. O'Connell returned to

Rome with the decrees of the Council, to submit them, as is the ancient custom, to the Holy See for approbation. Bishops Moore, Gilmour, and Dwenger went at the same time as a committee of the American episcopate. In June of that year he was made Rector of the American College at Rome, but did not assume the duties of that office until the spring of 1886. In the meantime he was occupied with the printing and final publication of the legislation prepared by the Council.

As Rector of the American College, Mgr. O'Connell devoted close attention to multiplying the number of students, providing for their greater physical comfort, and placing the finances of the College on a solid basis. During his incumbency, six life-scholarships were founded, all debts paid off, and a notable sum left in the treasury of the institution. During the same period, he was constantly at the service of the American episcopate, a task that meant much self-sacrifice and devotion, since at that time the Apostolic Delegation to the United States had not yet been established.

Thus, during the year 1886, he aided His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons in the now famous question of the condemnation of the Knights of Labor. The counsel and services of Mgr. O'Connell were constantly called on during this important episode. Similarly, he coöperated with Archbishops Keane and Ireland in the matter of the Constitutions and papal approval for the University that was being founded at Washington. In October, 1892, he accompanied Archbishop Satolli as papal representative to the Committee of Archbishops. Shortly afterwards Archbishop Satolli was raised to the position of first Apostolic Delegate to the Catholic Church in the United States. Since 1896 Mgr. O'Connell has held the office of Vicar of His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, in his cardinalatial church of Santa Maria in Trastevere.

From this brief statement of the career of Mgr. O'Connell, it will be seen that he brings to the University ripe and varied experience. His acquaintance with the problems and needs of the Catholic Church in the United States has been gained at first hand, and in daily contact with the hierarchy and the Roman authorities. His acquired knowledge, quick sympathy

with all noble educational ideals, and other similar qualities, give every reason to trust that his administration will be a successful one; that it will justify all the hopes aroused by his nomination, and leave the University in every sense an assured fact.

RT. REV. THOMAS J. CONATY, D.D.

Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Conaty, D.D., received in April the papal brief appointing him to the see of Los Angeles, as successor to the Rt. Rev. George Montgomery, D.D., who was recently designated Coadjutor to the Archbishop of San Francisco.

Dr. Conaty was named second Rector of the University by Pope Leo XIII., November 22, 1896, and was installed January 19, 1897. He was promoted to the dignity of Domestic Prelate June 2, 1897, and was consecrated, November 24, 1901, Bishop of Samos.

The term of Dr. Conaty's rectorship began shortly after the Schools of Philosophy and of the Social Sciences had been added to the School of Theology. This development of the University involved numerous problems and details of organization which could be settled only as time and experience suggested a solution. Dr. Conaty's efforts were accordingly directed, in the first instance, upon the internal relations of the University—the coördination of the various departments in the several schools and the consolidation of all the schools with a view to greater efficiency. To this work the Rector brought a knowledge of educational conditions which enabled him to adjust university requirements and policy to the needs of the secondary schools without lowering the standards of the University itself.

The same period witnessed an active growth of the institutions immediately connected with the University. Considerable additions were made to St. Thomas' College, the novitiate of the Paulist Fathers. The Marists, in 1897, transferred their College to the new building adjoining the grounds of the University, and, in 1902, began the construction of a second building for their Juniorate. In 1899, the new College of the Holy Cross was opened. In the same year, the Franciscans dedicated their College of the Holy Land. The Sulpicians opened St. Austin's College, their house of studies, in 1901; the

Dominicans purchased, in 1902, the ground on which they are now erecting their college; and, in the same year, arrangements were made for the location, on the University grounds, of the Apostolic Mission House, whose first students had found a temporary residence in Keane Hall. Provision was also made for the higher education of women under Catholic auspices by the establishment of Trinity College, which opened its courses in 1900. The varied interests represented by these religious communities necessitated a careful study of their relations to the University, and of the whole question of affiliation, which was finally placed, towards the end of Dr. Conaty's rectorship, upon a definite basis.

While these movements were grouping the orders about the University, Dr. Conaty was equally earnest in his endeavor to make the University the center of Catholic education in the United States. The Holy See, in giving the University its constitution, urged this unification of our institutions; and the Rector used all his influence to make the Catholic system a concrete reality. With this object in view, he organized the Conference of Catholic Colleges and presided at its annual meetings, the first of which was held in 1899. A similar impetus was given to the work of the theological seminaries and, quite recently, to the work of elementary instruction in the parochial schools.

In the conduct of these different undertakings, within the University and without, Dr. Conaty was uniformly courteous and forbearing. While deeply interested in making the University a power for good in the country at large, he was no less solicitous in maintaining its high standards. That the same breadth of view will characterize his action in the new field of labor to which he is called, there can be no doubt. The success which awaits him there will be the natural outcome of sincere and laborious efforts in pursuit of worthy ideals. We wish him a hearty godspeed in the work of episcopal administration. The diocese of Los Angeles will find in him a fatherly ruler, well acquainted with the real needs of our American Catholic population, unsparing of himself, and filled with that large charity that is the outcome of manifold experience with all kinds and conditions of men.

COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, 1902-1903.

The commencement exercises were held, as usual, in the Assembly Room, McMahon Hall, Wednesday, June 10, at 10 A. M., in the presence of a distinguished assembly of clergy and laity. After a brief introductory discourse by the Dean of the Faculty of Theology on the origin and nature of university degrees, the successful candidates were presented to the Rt. Rev. Rector by their respective Deans. At the close of the simple but impressive ceremony the Rt. Rev. Rector delivered a discourse of encouragement to the assembled students, in which he brought out strongly the fact that theological studies were of a necessity the living center of a Catholic University. The harmonious union of all the sciences was the true ideal of the members of a university, and this ideal could best be realized when all coöperated to raise to her proper position the oldest and the most queenly of all. Theology had, indeed, to receive illustration and coöperation from all other sciences, but she in turn was destined to bring to all of them a still nobler benefit, viz, the knowledge of God, His place in the universe and its relations to Him. After the ceremony, refreshments were served to the assembled guests and an informal reception was held by the Rt. Rev. Rector.

The degrees conferred were as follows:

Bachelor of Laws (LL.B.).

McQuilkin DeGrange,	<i>Frederick, Md.</i>
A.B. (Johns Hopkins University) 1900.	
William Augustine Feuchs,	<i>Wurtsboro, N. Y.</i>
Frank Joseph Noonan,	<i>Creston, Iowa.</i>

Master of Laws (LL.M.).

James Richard Lawlor,	<i>Waterbury, Conn.</i>
LL.B. (Southwestern Baptist University, Jackson, Tenn.) 1902.	

Doctor of Law (J.D.).

Kiyomihi Seshimo,	<i>Tokio, Japan.</i>
LL.B. (Tokio Hogakuin Law College) 1888.	
Dissertation:—"A Comparative Review of the Patent Systems of the Leading Countries of Europe, America and Asia."	

Doctor of Civil Law (D.C.L.).

Theodore Papazoglou Ion,	<i>Smyrna, Turkey.</i>
LL.B. (Faculté de Droit, Paris), LL.L. (<i>Ibid.</i>), J.D. (The Catholic University of America) 1899.	
Dissertation:—"Comparative Study of the Roman Law with the Mahometan Jurisprudence and of the Influence of the Former on the Latter."	

John Weitzel Forney Smith, *Washington, D. C.*
 LL.B. (Columbia University) 1892; LL.M. (ibid.) 1893.
 Dissertation:—"The Historical Evolution of the Pretorian Law."

Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.).

Rev. Charles Albert Dubary, S.M., *Washington, D. C.*
 S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1899.
 Dissertation:—"The Theory of Psychical Dispositions."
 Rev. Thomas Verner Moore, C.S.P., *New York, N. Y.*
 Dissertation:—"A Study in Reaction-Time and Movement."

Bachelor in Sacred Theology (S.T.B.).

Rev. John Walter Healy Corbett, *Archdiocese of Boston.*
 A.B. (Fordham College) 1898; A.M. (Georgetown University) 1899.
 Rev. John Edward Flood, *Archdiocese of Philadelphia.*
 A.B. (Catholic High School, Philadelphia) 1895.
 Rev. Emil Lawrence Gerardi, C.S.P., *New York, N. Y.*
 A.B. (St. Francis College, Quincy, Ill.) 1899; A.M. (ibid.) 1900.
 Rev. John Joseph Greaney, *Diocese of Pittsburgh.*
 A.B. (Manhattan College) 1898.
 Rev. Ralph Hunt, *Archdiocese of San Francisco.*
 Rev. William Patrick McNamara, *Archdiocese of Boston.*
 Ph.B. (St. John's Seminary, Brighton) 1899.
 Rev. Edward Joseph Mullaly, C.S.P., *New York, N. Y.*
 A.B. (St. Mary's College, Oakland, Cal.) 1899.
 Rev. Michael Joseph Neufeld, *Archdiocese of New York.*
 Rev. Jerome Louis O'Hern, C.S.P., *New York, N. Y.*
 Rev. William Ignatius Phelan, *Diocese of Springfield.*
 A.B. (Holy Cross College, Worcester) 1898.
 Rev. John Peter Ries, S.M., *Washington, D. C.*
 Rev. John Gerard Schmidt, *Archdiocese of St. Louis.*
 Rev. Henry Joseph Seiller, S.M., *Washington, D. C.*
 Rev. Henry Ignatius Stark, C.S.P., *New York, N. Y.*
 A.B. (St. Mary's College, Oakland) 1899.
 Rev. Matthew Aloysius Schumacher, C.S.C., *Washington, D. C.*
 A.B. (Notre Dame University) 1899.

Licentiate in Sacred Theology (S.T.L.).

Rev. William Patrick Clark, *Archdiocese of Cincinnati.*
 S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1902.
 Dissertation:—"The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews: A Study of some early Christian Evidences in the Alexandrian Church."
 Rev. John Joseph Crane, *Archdiocese of Boston.*
 Ph.B. (St. John's Seminary, Brighton) 1898; S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1902.
 Dissertation:—"The Synoptic Question: Its History and Present Standing."
 Rev. Thomas Gaffney, *Archdiocese of Chicago.*
 A.B. (Christian Brothers' College, St. Louis) 1888; A.M. (ibid.) 1890; B.S. (ibid.) 1893; A.B. (St. Viateur's College, Bourbonsais, Ill.) 1897; A.M. (ibid.) 1900; S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1901.
 Dissertation:—"The Bible a Witness to Its Own Inspiration."
 Rev. James Aloysius Gallagher, *Archdiocese of Philadelphia.*
 A.B. (La Salle College, Philadelphia) 1893; S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1902.
 Dissertation:—"St. Paul's Testimony to the Credibility of the Gospel Narrative as regards the Resurrection of Christ."

- Rev. James Martin Gillis, C.S.P., *New York, N. Y.*
 Ph.B. (St. John's Seminary, Brighton) 1898; S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1902.
 Dissertation:—"The Agapé: Its Existence and its Relation with The Holy Eucharist."
- Rev. William Hugh Grant, *Archdiocese of Boston.*
 Ph.B. (St. John's Seminary, Brighton) 1898; S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1902.
 Dissertation:—"The History and Criticism of the 'Satisfaction Idea' in the Doctrine of the Atonement."
- Rev. Thomas Patrick Heverin, *Archdiocese of San Francisco.*
 A.B. (St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore) 1895; A.M. (*ibid.*) 1896; S.T.B. (*ibid.*) 1899.
 Dissertation:—"Authority and Reason and the Relations Between Them."
- Rev. Timothy Peter Holland, S.S., *Moira, N. Y.*
 A.B. (Ottawa University) 1896; S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1902.
 Dissertation:—"The Condition of the English Clergy in the Last Half of the Fourteenth Century."
- Rev. James Patrick McGraw, *Diocese of Syracuse.*
 A.B. (Manhattan College, New York) 1897; S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1902.
 Dissertation:—"Excommunication in the First Three Centuries: A Study in Church Discipline."
- Rev. Thomas Edward McGuigan, *Archdiocese of Baltimore.*
 A.B. (St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore) 1897; A.M. (*ibid.*) 1898; S.T.B. (*ibid.*) 1900.
 Dissertation:—"Origen in Reply to Celsus."
- Rev. William Bernard Martin, *Archdiocese of New York.*
 A.B. (St. Francis Xavier's College, New York) 1897; S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1902.
 Dissertation:—"Religion among the Huron, Iroquois, and Algonkin Indians: An Historical Study based upon the Relations of the Jesuits."
- Rev. Leo Francis O'Neil, *Archdiocese of Boston.*
 A.B. (Boston College) 1897; S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1902.
 Dissertation:—"The Doctrine of Original Sin in the First Four Centuries: A Positive Study."
- Rev. John Stephen Shanahan, *Archdiocese of Dubuque.*
 S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1902.
 Dissertation:—"The Constitution of the Church as portrayed in the Ignatian Epistles."
- Doctor in Sacred Theology (S.T.D.).**
- Rev. Patrick Joseph Healy, *Archdiocese of New York.*
 S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1898; S.T.L. (*ibid.*) 1899.
 Dissertation:—"The Valerian Persecution (A. D. 257-260)."
- Rev. John Webster Melody, *Archdiocese of Chicago.*
 A.B. (St. Ignatius College, Chicago) 1885; A.M. (St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore) 1887; S.T.B. (*ibid.*) 1889; S.T.L. (The Catholic University of America) 1893.
 Dissertation:—"The Physical Basis of Marriage."
- Rev. Maurice Joseph O'Connor, *Archdiocese of Boston.*
 Ph.B. (St. John's Seminary, Brighton) 1894; S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1898; S.T.L. (*ibid.*) 1899.
 Dissertation:—"Responsibility and the Moral Life."

THE UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

The Dominican House of Studies.—Ground was broken on Wednesday, April 23, for the new Dominican House of Studies, on the Bunker Hill road, opposite the University. Cardinal Gibbons conducted the ceremony, surrounded by many members of the episcopate and clergy. This institution will form a quadrangle of 200 feet each way, and will be a notable addition to the group of buildings located on the grounds or in the immediate vicinity of the University.

The Apostolic Mission House.—On Wednesday, April 23, the corner-stone of the new Apostolic Mission House was laid by Cardinal Gibbons, in the presence of many members of the episcopate and clergy and a large concourse of laity. The sermon was delivered by the Most Rev. Archbishop Keane of Dubuque.

The new building will be erected under the auspices of the Catholic Missionary Union, a corporation organized six years ago under the laws of the State of New York for the purpose of placing missionaries in the south and west of this country. The new institution will be national in character, in that the diocesan priests from the various dioceses of the United States will receive training for missionary work within its walls.

The Mission House will cost about \$50,000. It faces Bunker Hill road and will occupy a plot of ground 200 feet square located near the easterly gate of the campus, and about 400 feet from Keane Hall. The site has been leased by the University Trustees to the Catholic Missionary Union for an indefinite period. The basement of the building will include the kitchen and apartments for the employes, the storerooms and the boiler rooms. On the first floor will be a large chapel and a few class rooms. The remainder of the building will consist of private rooms.

Gift of Books from Bishop Messmer.—The University has received from Bishop Messmer of Green Bay a gift of more than 150 valuable books. It returns him sincere thanks for this expression of his continued interest in the library of the Faculty of Theology.